THE

Churchman's Magazine.

[Vol. IV.] OCTOBER, 1807. [No. 10.]

BIOGRAPHY.

Memoirs of the Right Reverend Samuel Horsley, LL.D.

F. R. and A. SS. late Lord Bishop of St. Asaph.

[Continued from page 326.]

IN 1782 bishop Lowth presented his chaplain with the rectory of South Weald, in Essex, to which was added, about the same period, the honorable distinction of Archdeacon of St. Alban's.

The publication of Dr. Priestley's history of the corruptions of christianity, in 2 volumes 8vo. attracting considerable notice, on account of the boldness of its positions, our archdeacon took occasion at his visitation in 1783, to enter in his charge on a critical review of that history, or rather of that part which relates to the faith of the three first ages in the doctrine of the trinity. This charge was soon afterwards published at the request of the reverend auditors; and its reception by the public justified that request, for it shook the unitarian edifice, pompous and gaudy as it seemed, entirely to the foundation, and exposed the plagiarism and ignorance of the architect in the clearest manner. Dr. Priestly, however, was not to be convinced; and he immediately addressed a series of letters to the archdeacon, in which, though his confidence remained, and his tone was elevated, his weakness and insufficiency to the contest were but the more apparent. Dr. Horsley replied in seventeen letters, in a style of mingled dignity and irony, tempered with the manners of a gentleman, and the spirit of a christian. The argument from tradition for the divinity of Christ was decided; and any other man than Priestley would have acknowleged his conviction and recanted, or been silent. But this would have been out of his character. The modern patriarch of Socinianism was become infuriate, and, without consideration, issued from the press a second series of letters to the archdeacon, in which he repeated all his former assertions, without refuting, and sometimes without noticing, the arguments and proofs by which they had been confuted. The spirit in which these epistles were composed, will appear from the following extracts. "At length," says he, "you have condescended to gratify my wishes, and have favored me with a series of letters in answer to mine; but as they are written with a degree of *insolence*, which nothing in your situation or mine can justify, and indicate a temper that appears to me to be very far from being the most pro-

per for the discusion of historical truth, I shall consider myself in this answer, as writing not so much to you, as to the candid part of the public, to whom our correspondence is open; and I have no doubt but that I shall be able to satisfy all who are gratified to judge between us, that your *ignorance* is equal to your *insolence;* and therefore that there is no great reason to regret that you have formed a resolution to appear no more in this controversy."

Of the church established by law, and forming part of the constitution, this *liberal-minded* polemic thus expressed his sentiment:

"You, sir, as archdeacon of St. Alban's, may believe that the church of England will continue to the end of the world; and that *all nations* (at least all that speak the English language, and can read the book of common prayer in the original) *will flow into it.* On the other hand, it is my firm persuasion, that when *Babylon the great, the mother of harlots*, shall fall, all her *daughters*, all the *little Babylons*, all the *lesser establishments*, of what I deem to be corrupt christianity, will fall with her, or soon after; and therefore I apply to them, as well as to the church of Rome, that awful warning, Rev. xviii. 4, *Come out of her, my people, that ye partake not of her plagues.*"

After such a display of urbanity and Christianity, to say nothing of the intelligence and ability contained in these letters, the archdeacon would have been warranted in declining, as he had originally intended, all further controversy with a writer of this description; but conceiving that the interests of religious truth might be injured by his silence, he condescended still farther to notice the Doctor's proofs and reasonings in support of his falling cause. He accordingly published another series of letters, which closed the dispute. On christmas-day, in the year 1785, Dr. Horsley delivered a sermon in his church at Newington, on the incarnation of Christ, which he shortly afterwards printed, as having an intimate connection with the controversy in which he had been recently engaged. In 1789, the charge, with the letters and this sermon, were collected together, and published in one very elegantly printed volume, from the press of the benevolent Mr. Raikes at Gloucester*. The service rendered to the cause of orthodoxy by the archdeacon in these perform-

* As these tracts are now become very scarce, the possessors of them, whether in the original, or the collected edition, will be glad to have an opportunity of seeing the following correction, written in the author's own hand in the margin of a presented copy of the collection of 1789.

At page 442, line 11, for "but what are" read "what might be."

At line 12 of the same page, after the word "Gnostics" add, "From a passage, however, in Irenæus cap. xii. I am inclined to think the Ebionites were not included in that name. Having charged the Marcionites with the crime of rejecting a considerable part of the New Testament, he adds, that the other sects of the Gnostics received the whole New Testament, but perverted the sense by misrepresentation. Now the Ebionites received only the gospel of St. Matthew, and that they received according to a mutilated and corrupt edition of their own. Yet the Ebionites were not Marcionites, consequently not Gnostics."

It may not be amiss to add in this place, that the author of the strictures on Dr. Priestley's letters, forming No. III. of the appendix to the first collection of Dr. Horsley's letters, was Dr. Townson, author of the discourse on the four gospels; and that Dr. Horsley's learned correspondent mentioned in the postscript to the seventh letter, was Dr. John Erskine, one of the ministers of Edinburgh.

ances, procured for him, though unsolicited on his own behalf, or that of his friends, a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Gloucester. His patron on this occasion was the late lord Thurlow, then chancellor, and the cause is said to have been this:—His lordship happened to be upon a visit to a nobleman in Norfolk; and being about to return to town, he requested the nobleman to lend him a pamphlet to amuse him on his journey. By chance or design, his lordship put into his hands Dr. Horsley's letters to Priestley. Lord Thurlow was so struck with the uncommon eloquence, deep and various learning, and acute and solid reasoning, exhibited in the letters, that he frankly said to a friend, "that man deserves to be a bishop, and he shall be one; for they who defend the church ought to be supported by the church." The first fruits of this opinion was, as we have said, the prebend of Gloucester, notice of which preferment Dr. Horsley received one evening at his parsonage of South Weald, immediately on which he set out for London to pay his respects to the chancellor, with whom he kept up a most friendly intercourse till death parted them, but only for a few weeks.

In 1787 Dr. Horsley preached a most admirable sermon in Gloucester cathedral at an ordination held there, and this discourse gave such satisfaction to that learned prelate Dr. Samuel Hallifax, then bishop of that church, that he requested the doctor to make it public. The sermon was accordingly printed at Gloucester with this title, "The Analogy between the Light of Inspiration and the Light of Learning as Qualifications for the Ministry." 4to. The principle assumed and argued upon in this ingenious and profound sermon is, that human learning has been substituted by the Almighty since the cessation of the apostolic gift of inspiration, as a qualification for the christian ministry. To the sermon is appended a view and explication of the spiritual gifts mentioned 1 Corinthians xii. and in which exposition Dr. Horsley in the main follows the learned Lightfoot.

This discourse received two answers from quarters very opposite to each other. The irascible and conceited Gilbert Wakefield attacked it on the Socinian side, and a divine, then popular in London as one of the evangelical or calvinistical preachers, levelled a quarto pamphlet against the sermon, in which he endeavored to maintain the notion that divine inspiration is still continued to the "Elect."

On the translation of Dr. Smallwell from the see of St. David's to that of Oxford, in 1788, Dr. Horsley was deservedly elevated to the episcopal bench, and that entirely through the strenuous exertions of the Chancellor, who had on the occasion to contend against very strong influence which was made use of in favor of some friends of the minister.

Being thus placed in a situation for which his virtues and his talents were so eminently adapted, he directly applied himself to the duties of a christian bishop. His diocese was large, and its condition was such as to stand in need of much correction and improvement. Great carelessness had prevailed with regard to the appointment and salaries of the curates: in consequence of which too many persons were admitted to holy orders whose qualifications were but indifferent. It had been very unwisely considered, that as the livings were in general small, and a knowledge of the Welch language was in

dispensible in the officiating ministers, it was, therefore, necessary to admit persons as curates whose acquirements in other respects were very slender. Bishop Horsley was much concerned at this, and he took up the resolution, on which indeed he uniformly acted, of examining the candidates himself; he also looked very narrowly into the testimonials and titles of the candidates, as many abuses in both articles had prevailed till his time. And as he was thus circumspect, like his great predecessor bishop Bull*, in endeavoring to prevent improper and unqualified persons from entering into the service of the sanctuary, so he was equally attentive to the comfortable condition and conduct of the clergy of his diocese. He raised the salaries of the curates, many of which were below ten pounds a year; and when some of the incumbents murmured at the regulation, the bishop coolly informed them, that they had their remedy by *residing* on their livings, and performing the duty themselves.

His first charge delivered in 1790, was printed the same year, and attracted universal notice. It is, indeed, one of the best pastoral addresses that has been known since the apostolical age; and it ought to be carefully and repeatedly perused by every one who is engaged in the office of dispensing the word of life†. The bishop pointed his exhortation principally to the *matter of instruction* necessary for ordinary congregations, and which he forcibly stated ought to be *doctrinal* as well as *practical*, contrary to a very erroneous, but too prevalent notion, that "the laity, the more illiterate especially, have little concern with the mysteries of revealed religion, provided they be attentive to its duties."

But the most striking part of this charge, is that wherein the bishop combats the delusive and dangerous maxim, that "morality is the sum of practical religion," which maxim had been almost as much as any thing, the cause of that general indifference to christian doctrine and christian order, which is so visible in these planet-stricken times. This charge, as we have already observed, on its appearance from the press, became the subject of general attention. The sentiments contained in it, and some expressions concerning the "Moralizing Unitarians," gave great offence to those who affectedly call themselves "Rational Christians." Gilbert Wakefield vented his indignation in a very scurrilous philippic against the bishop; and a sturdy Socinian at Caermarthen published two pamphlets on the subject of the charge, written in a very coarse style, under the title of a "Welsh Freeholder."

Of late this charge has been pretty much quoted by those writers who assert the calvinism of the church of England, and who arrogate to themselves the name of "True Churchmen," on account of their own attachment to that system. Because bishop Horsley maintains the doctrine of justification by faith, and denies that morality is religion, or that works are meritorious, these gentlemen have very wisely concluded, that he is on their side. Nothing can be more unjust. The bishop's ideas are perfectly scriptural, and in unison

* See Mr. Nelson's life of bishop Bull, page 414.

† The excellent society for promoting christian knowledge have most judiciously adopted this valuable charge into their catalogue of tracts, and caused it to be printed in a cheap form.

with the doctrine of the articles and homilies; but he never denied free agency in man, or the conditional obligation of good works for justification. Because he warned his clergy against a corrupt mode of teaching, which made "morality all in all, and excluded the peculiar doctrines of revealed religion," these pretended *True Churchmen* have taken and applied particular passages of his charge in favor of their tenets, to which, in fact, they have just as much relation as the sound doctrine of our church with regard to the Eucharistic sacrifice, has to the Popish error of the real presence.

In 1789, the bishop preached the anniversary sermon before the Royal Humane Society, of which he was vice-president, on that appropriate passage, Ecclesiastes xii. 7. The title of the printed discourse is, "The Principle of Vitality in Man, as described in the Holy Scriptures, and the difference between real and apparent death." This is, indeed, a most able and philosophical sermon, and it passed through several editions. From the description of the human system given by Solomon, the learned prelate infers, that he was acquainted with the true doctrine of the circulation of the blood.

This year he also dictated the address which was presented by the same society to their royal patron, on account of his recovery.

The vigorous attempt made by the dissenters in 1790 to obtain the repeal of the corporation and test acts, occasioned the bishop to publish, but without his name, "A Review of the Case of the Protestant Dissenters;" a pamphlet of extraordinary merit, and distinguished by great novelty of argument on a subject which had repeatedly engaged the powers of the ablest reasoners. Though this tract was anonymous, all parties united in ascribing it to the real author, and some of the dissenters directly replied to it as the production of the bishop of St. David's.

All Europe was filled with astonishment at the atrocities which marked the French revolution; and deep, indeed, was the concern which every feeling mind expressed on the inhuman butchery of the mild and virtuous Louis the Sixteenth. The English parliament being then sitting, it was thought proper that the thirtieth of January should be observed with due solemnity by the two houses; and the bishop of St. David's was accordingly appointed to preach the sermon on the occasion before the lords at the abbey. The attendance was very numerous, the recent circumstance, as it were, naturally recalling to general recollection the bloody stain which disgraces the English annals in the murder of a religious monarch, on a scaffold before his royal palace. The bishop's sermon is a complete refutation of that preposterous, but too generally received hypothesis, that absolute liberty is natural to man. He proves that man never did exist in what is called a state of nature; consequently that "civil society, which always implies government, is the condition to which God originally destined man. Whence the obligation on the citizen to submit to government, is an immediate result from that first principle of religious duty, which requires that man conform himself as far as in him lies, with the will and purpose of his Maker." At the conclusion of this discourse, the bishop drew a strong picture of the state of France, which very sensibly affected his auditors, and was circulated all over the kingdom through the

public prints. When the sermon was printed, his lordship subjoined to it an appendix, in which he vindicates Calvin from the charge of being a friend to the levelling system.

At the yearly meeting of the charity children at St. Paul's, June 6, 1793, the bishop preached a most excellent sermon on Luke iv. 18, 19, in which he defends, with his accustomed strength of reasoning, the doctrine of Christ's divinity, and urges, in a beautiful strain of eloquence, the benefit and duty of communicating religious instruction to the poor.

The year following, the bishop was translated to the see of Rochester, with the deanry of Westminster, void by the death of bishop Thomas. In the church of Westminster he made several excellent regulations, particularly with regard to the condition of the members of the choir, whose salaries he caused to be augmented.

In 1795, we find our indefatigable prelate preaching and publishing two sermons: one before the venerable society for the propagation of the gospel in foreign parts, and the other at the anniversary of the Magdalen, in the chapel of that institution. This last is entitled, "The Enjoyments of the future Life and true Notion of Christian Purity," from 1 John iii, 3; and though a very orthodox and perspicuous explication of the doctrine, "that the glorified bodies of mortals will resemble, in some measure, that of the Savior in his exaltation;" it was made the subject of some severe remarks in that singular performance the "Pursuits of Literature," the learned but eccentric author of which, seemed to have a personal pique against the bishop of Rochester. Why he should, it would, perhaps, be no very difficult matter to ascertain, if our conjecture respecting him be right.

[To be continued.]

FOR THE CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE.

On Infant Baptism and the Unity of the Church.

[Continued from page 338.]

BUT to give a juster idea of the subject now under discussion, it may be well to consider who the apostles were, and to whom they were sent. The apostles were Jews, educated in that church which had always received infants by a positive command of God; and if there is any dependence to be placed upon ecclesiastical history, all who conformed to the Jewish religion were initiated, both adults and infants, by baptism, as well as circumcision, as an emblem of their being washed from their idolatrous pollutions.

With these prepossessions Christ sent forth his Apostles to disciple all nations to his religion: and is there a shadow of reason to suppose they would so construe their commission, as to receive only adults into the church, and shut the door against their infants and little ones, contrary to the universal practice of God's Church; and without any authority from their Lord: and would not the Jews (to whom they were first sent) have raised the loudest clamors against the christian church, because she shut out their children,

which, by God's appointment, the Jewish church had always received. But we hear of no murmurings upon this account, nor a single word from Christ or his Apostles, by way of prohibition. Hence I infer that it was the will of Christ that infants should be received into the church by baptism, and that they were accordingly admitted by the Apostles and their successors, to the present day.

This shows why the word children, or infants, is not in the commission; as they had ever been received, the words, *all nations*, comprehending every age and every sex, was sufficient.

Once more—That the Apostles did consider their commission as empowering them to baptize infants, their own practice, and the practice of the universal church, from the Apostles to the present day, leave not a shadow of doubt. When we read of the Apostles, baptizing whole households and families, it would be a very extraordinary case should there be no children. By the same rule that one man says there were no children, I may assert, and with much more propriety, there were a number of children.

But be that as it may, it is certain that those Bishops and Pastors who received their authority and knowledge of christianity from the Apostles, could not be ignorant concerning these things; and we have the concurring testimony of all those Primitive Fathers, that the practice of baptizing infants was from the Apostles, coequal with the church itself, being both derived from Christ.

It is a proper question to put to those persons who deny this, When did the baptizing of infants commence? Or how could it be introduced and universally practised by the church if christianity had subsisted some years without it?

Supposing I should affirm, and endeavor to persuade the people of any town, that there was a particular spring in a certain place, to which every infant that was ever born in the town, had been carried and washed, and that they must continue the practice, or their children could never acquire the inheritance of their estates; Is there any grounds to believe that I could persuade one man, much less every inhabitant to believe this story, when no one had ever heard of, or washed his children in this spring?

Just as little reason is there to believe that *infant baptism* was not apostolical, if the christian church had existed a number of years without it; and then it was introduced and universally acknowledged to be apostolical.

On many subjects of this nature I know it does not become men to be too positive; but respecting these things I am so certain that they are apostolical, that I dare challenge all the world to ascertain a time, from any competent authority, when they did begin, short of the days of the Apostles. And if they cannot do this, they ought in good conscience, not to ridicule any one for the belief of them; but to acknowledge and believe that they did not have their beginning from a later date.

On the other hand if they demand when the christian church began to deny this to be apostolical, I answer, the christian church never did deny it. But we are able to tell when the dissenters from the church began to call it in question; even the persons, and the place where, and all from indisputable authority. Eleven hundred

and fifty years had passed away after Christ, before there was any one sect of christians on the globe, who acknowledged any baptism, but who administered it to infants. And it was even as late as A. D. 1530, before there were Baptists enough to organize themselves into any thing like a numerous body.

Is it reasonable to believe that the whole christian church, who had received their knowledge of christianity from Jesus Christ, his Apostles and successors, were all mistaken in an article of religion so important as that of infant baptism, and continue in that mistake for more than 1500 years, and this error after so long a period should be discovered and rectified by a few ignorant fanatics, who rose against the state as well as against the church. I say, can any man in his right reason, with the bible and the history of the church in his hands, believe this? I could as soon believe that *Simon Magus* was more orthodox than St. Peter, and the incestuous Corinthian more virtuous than St. Paul.

The only way to avoid the force of this reasoning, is to say that no arguments drawn from history are of any force, or ought to be admitted in this case, and to demand plain positive texts of scripture. But I beseech such objectors to consider what mischief they are doing the christian cause by this means; they are weakening the most substantial evidence for its truth; *i. e.* the correspondence of ancient prophecy with historical facts, and the mutual agreement between sacred and profane history.

Our Savior while on earth prophecied the destruction of Jerusalem, the fulfilment of which will forever remain a powerful evidence of the truth of his divine mission. But for the truth of this, we must rely entirely upon human testimony, for the scriptures say not a single word about it.

Supposing a *Deist* should attack one of these people, and call Jesus an impostor for uttering such a prophecy: Undoubtedly he would say it was fulfilled. No, says the Deist—there is not a single passage in the bible to prove it. What would be the answer? Alas! he could not rescue his Lord and Master from the foul imputation of a deceiver.

Some people are weak enough to ask, "What good does it do to baptise an infant?" I answer, as much good as it did to circumcise an infant; that it was and is the will of God that they should be thus made visible members of the church, as preparatory to the church triumphant; as much good as it did to sprinkle blood upon the door posts, &c.

I also ask why was there more virtue in Abel's offering a lamb, than in Cain's offering the fruits of the earth?

Again—what good did it do Naaman to dip seven times in the river Jordan? Was it the water that healed him? Certainly not.—Would he have been cleansed if he had not obeyed the divine command? Certainly he would not. I further ask, what moral connection there is between Christ's sufferings and death, and the salvation of mankind, but that it was the will of heaven to appoint this way, and institute these means for the faith and obedience of men. Once more, I ask what good it does to baptize an adult? But thus the will of God is, that they should hereby be washed in the laver

of regeneration, and through the blood of Christ receive remission of sins, and be made lively members of Christ.

And, to quote the reasoning of Naaman's servants, if God *had bid thee* use some costly means to free your *infant offspring* from their original pollution, and entitle them to the covenant blessings of the gospel, would you not have done it? how much more, when he only bids you wash them, that they may be clean. Are we wiser than God? Has he commanded, and shall we not obey? How heaven-daring is that man who challenges the authority of God, by calling in question the efficacy and necessity of his institutions! This is not to learn of the meek and lowly Jesus, who is the author of peace andunity.

But after all this, and the arguments in favor of infant baptism are found unanswerable, the mode is called in question. As it respects the article of plunging or sprinkling, there is no doubt but what they were both used in the apostolic age, and hence they are both practised in the church, and I believe there is as much scripture in favor of sprinkling as of plunging, and that no one may be deceived, I will cite a few passages, as Numb. 8 & 7. *And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them, sprinkle water upon them.* And again, *The Priest shall sprinkle the water of separation.* And that sprinkling might be continued under the gospel, the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel, alluding to baptism, say—*So shall he sprinkle many nations; and then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you.* That the apostles on many occasions did sprinkle, is apparent from many passages, as Heb. 10. 29. *Let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.* That a person is thoroughly cleansed, in the scripture sense, without plunging, we learn from the 13th of St. John, where, after our Savior had washed the feet of his disciples, Peter insisted upon a more thorough washing. But Jesus saith to him, *He that is washed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit.* That there is any moral virtue, in much or little water, is contrary to scripture and reason, especially in that noted text of St. Peter, 1 Ep. iii. 21. alluding to Noah's being saved by water, he says—*The like figure whereunto even baptism doth now also save us: not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.* It is very evident that Noah was not plunged into the flood, but rode above it in the ark, which was a type of the church into which baptism doth admit us. Again—the children of Israel, who were all *baptized in the sea*, were so far from plunging into the water, that it was *a wall upon each side, and they went over dry shod; there was a mist which sprinkled them, and by which they were baptized.* The instance of the *three thousand*, who were added to the church by baptism upon the day of Pentecost, is one of those sacred lessons that is replete with much instruction; for it would have been impossible for the Apostles to have led them out of the city and plunged them all in some river or pond, according to the modern custom. I therefore infer, that, like the eunuch, professing their belief in Jesus, they were baptized without going out of the

temple. But as the church does not refuse to plunge, no more need be said.

In the next place there is a great outcry against the promises made in baptism. To show that all objections against these are founded in prejudice, let us for a moment reflect. When a child is presented for baptism, after exhortation and prayers, the following question is put—"Dost thou in the name of this child renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the sinful desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them?" The answer—"I renounce them all; and by God's help will endeavor not to follow nor be led by them."

Now, does any christian in his sober senses, expect to go to heaven, without using his endeavors to renounce these? Can he expect to bring up his children in the *nurture, fear, and admonition of the Lord*, without endeavoring to instruct them to renounce these?—Does any christian parent, in any sect, who ever offers his child in baptism, virtually promise less? and what softer expressions can be used? I beseech people who object against these engagements to consult their bibles and their consciences. God says, *my son, give me thine heart;* and commands that we should *love the Lord our God with all our heart*, &c.; and our Savior tells us we cannot *serve God and Mammon; and he who loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him.* Now can any man so far deceive himself as to believe he lives under the influence of these sacred truths, and object against renouncing the devil! especially if he reflects that he is solemnly commanded and encouraged to do this. *Resist the devil and he will flee from thee.*

Consider further, it is the *vain pomps* of the world that are renounced. There are many things in and of the world that are good, and we are commanded to *use the world as not abusing it.* How reasonable and perfectly agreeable to scripture is all this, summed up in these modest and pious words—"*I will by God's help.*" Dare any one believe God will accept any thing short of this? If so, pray tell me what it is. Will your neighbor ever accept such conditional promises as you object even to make to your God? No—your obligation must run, *I promise*—and this was the resolution of Joshua, who was not afraid to promise for himself and family. *As for me and my house*, says he, *we will serve the Lord—If the Lord be God, then serve him*, and be not ashamed to own and confess him for yourselves and your families, and bear it in mind, he has left it on record, that *he who is ashamed of me and of my doctrine, of him will I be ashamed before my Father, and his holy angels.*

Public acknowledgment of God, and solemn engagement by parents, for themselves and children, have been always used; and the very language of the church in renouncing the devil, &c. was used in the Jewish church, and continued by them and all christian churches of every denomination, for more than 1500 years after Christ.

If a boy fourteen years of age must choose a guardian to direct him in civil life, how strange that even an infant must have no sponsor to protect and direct him in his religious life!

But all this is not so strange as to object against these promises, because some people who make them do not use their *endeavors* to keep them. But are the institutions of heaven to be neglected because some people make a bad use of them? Were the Apostles to be blamed because they baptized *Simon Magus*? Was the net condemned for inclosing bad fish with the good; or the field for producing tares!

I wish those who are so very liberal in rash judgment and eagle-eyed in discovering the motes and blemishes of their brethren, would listen to their Savior—*Judge not lest ye are judged: let him who is without sin cast the first stone.*

That there are those who neglect their baptismal vows, is sincerely to be lamented; and I do not hesitate to say they lie to God; and by thus *causing the way of truth to be evil spoken of*, they bring wrath upon themselves. Let all such remember our Savior has said, *Woe unto him by whom offence cometh; it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the depth of the sea.*

But it is further objected, we say the child after being baptized is *regenerate* and *born anew*. Is this more than the scripture says—*Except ye are born of water and of the spirit* (says the blessed Jesus) *ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* And says an Apostle, *ye are saved by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.* And again, *as many as are baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* But no where does the scripture say that regeneration is conversion, nor does the church.

Much more might be said to show the happy agreement between the scripture and the Liturgy of the church, especially the office of baptism. But enough is said to convince the unprejudiced and impartial. And those who are determined to find fault with the church, enough can never be said, and the more that is said the more they oppose themselves. Let us leave such then to the mercy of God, and the prayers of all good people—knowing that whenever they read the scriptures to find the *faith that was once delivered to the saints*, they will embrace the church as their *spiritual mother* and the spouse of Christ.

That these things may be deeply engraven upon the reader's mind, and excite a serious enquiry for the *true faith*, I shall conclude with a short recapitulation.

I have proved that God ordained that the infant offspring of all those who did enter themselves into his church, should also be admitted. I have shown that God's church has always been the same under different dispensations, and that the covenant established with Abraham was the covenant of grace, and that baptism succeeded circumcision, as a seal into the same covenant, and that every age and every sex are to be received—*male and female, bond and free.* I have moreover shown that the commission Christ gave his Apostles to baptize all nations, implied the baptizing of infants, and that they actually understood it in this sense and practised accordingly, baptizing whole families and households, in which it is more than probable there were infants, as many were baptized of whom

we have no account of their being taught, or of their practical faith. I have also shown that in consequence of these institutions the Apostles and their successors baptized infants, and that the christian church universally, for more than a thousand years, was uniform in this practice, and that the apostolical church, *i. e.* all those churches which have derived their authority from the Apostles, universally continue the practice to the present day. We have furthermore observed that the reason why no one can prove when, where, or how infant baptism was introduced in an after age, is because it is of divine appointment, *by Jesus Christ himself.*

From all this we infer that *Christ approves of this charitable work in bringing infants to his holy baptism*—and that those who deny them this privilege, are guilty, in our Savior's sense, of shutting up the kingdom of heaven against them, and are injuring the cause which they wish to support, by suffering children to grow up as they are born, ignorant of God and of themselves. May God open their eyes to see the truth as it is in Jesus—for *I bear them record they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.*

FOR THE CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE.

On the Design and Use of Holy Time.

GOD having created the heavens and the earth, and all things they contain; having made man, and appointed him to be the king and sovereign of the whole; the tongue, the voice, and as it were the priest of this lower world, to offer up its praises and thanksgivings, to its Maker, and universal Lord; on the seventh day, he rested from all his labor, which he had created and made; *and he blessed and sanctified it; because in it he had rested from his labor.*

Here the first thing, that presents itself for our contemplation, is this, that, the world which we inhabit is not ours but God's; and of this we have the Holy Sabbath, as a sign, or token. God of his own free choice and infinite wisdom made it, stored it with its good things, and put us in possession of it; requiring only one day in seven, to be dedicated to his immediate service, as an acknowledgement of his sovereignty, as a token that all is his, and that it is only let to us: this easy rent he requires, and no more; a much less proportion, than men are willing to take from each other, of the fruits of the ground. But it is enough, to be a standing sign and token, that we live in God's world. Every returning holy day, admonishes us, if we will listen to it, that God made the world, and therefore it is his, by the best possible right. It bids us remember, that it did not spring up by chance, and is not therefore governed and directed by chance, but by infinite wisdom, and almighty power. It bids us look back to the time, when *the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy*, at the new creation; when God stretched forth his forming hand; and the shapeless matter obeyed his will. The earth took its form and station, the sun and moon began to roll, resplendant in the heavens; and the earth to swarm with

numerous tribes of living creatures. And finally, man appeared majestic in form, and wise in heart; for God breathed into him a rational soul; gave him a spark of that all directing essence, which pervades and puts in motion the universe.

When we have taken a view of these things, we cannot avoid seeing and feeling, that the world is God's, a truth which is perpetually slipping out of our minds.

But moreover, it is to stand as a token and sign, that not only the world we inhabit is God's, but ourselves also, are his creatures. This follows of course, from what has been already said; for man was created in the same six days, with other things, and pronounced *very good*. Man was a part of the same labor; he is therefore a creature of God, no less than others, only a little more exalted in his nature, made of better materials, and designed to be the mouth of creation, to offer unto God, its praises and thanksgivings. Thus the sabbath being a sign or token, that we are God's creatures, reminds us of the obligations we are under to him; and not only to him, but to ourselves and each other; for that we are the creatures and servants of some superior, is the foundation of all duty. He who made us, must be supposed to have a right of commanding our services, and directing how we shall deal with each other. Having created, he would not abandon and disregard the workmanship of his hands. Hence he has a right to say, and he does say to us, ye shall dedicate one seventh part of your time to my immediate service, in token and acknowledgment that ye are my servants. Ye shall pray to me, and seek my favor by supplication; ye shall remember my sabbath to keep it holy, in token that I made you; and that I redeemed, and new created you, when you had fallen from your first perfect state. Ye shall render me thanksgiving and praise, for these and all other benefits I am daily heaping on you. Ye shall seek the peace and welfare of each other, by doing justice, loving mercy, and walking humbly before me. All this is perfectly reasonable; and no way could so effectualty impress these all important truths on our minds, as a solemn day dedicated to the worship and immediate service of almighty God, in commemoration of his making us; a day frequently returning, and giving us no opportunity to let the truth slip out of our minds, through forgetfulness and inattention.

To perpetuate the memory, of great and illustrious deeds performed by men, and call forth the gratitude of nations, such days are frequently appropriated. Much more then, have we reason to perpetuate the memory of God's wonder-working power in the creation of the world, and redemption of man from his fallen state. Much more have we reason to expect, that it will awaken gratitude in our hearts; by leading us to reflect, that he called us from the womb of uncreated nothing, and has given us an opportunity to enjoy his works here, and if we forfeit not his favor by our own folly, to triumph in glory hereafter. We have the utmost reason to think, that with a great many, it has the effect of keeping them always mindful, that they are God's creatures; and therefore owe him and each other a great many indispensable duties. Nor have we much reason to think, that without it, men would very long continue to know and ac-

knowledge God. It is consequently, one of the fundemental institutions of religion.

But thirdly; by recurring to the original institution of holy time, it will appear to be a sign or token, how it is to be spent, in what kind of exercises. For God having finished the work of creation, rested from his labor on the seventh day, which he sanctified and made holy. Hence it follows, that as God rested from his work, so should we rest from ours on that day. That is, all the ordinary occupations, in which we are engaged to obtain the means of temporal subsistence, are to be laid aside, and the body left at rest; in order that the mind may without interruption be turned to things of more importance.

We should not allow ourselves even to think of plans of worldly business, or pleasure and recreation; much less to act our thoughts and desires on that holy day. All these thoughts should be suspended, while we are doing the work of the Lord; that great and bountiful Master, on whom we depend for all we are, and all we have, calls us to his service, and our own business ought to lie by. For suppose our business be ever so important, yet it is of only a temporary importance, while what God requires is of eternal moment; and his favor is worth more than worlds, which is not to be obtained, without obedience to his will.

Do we at all times sufficiently weigh these things in our minds, and act under the influence of them? It is much to be feared many of us do not. Deeply engaged all the week, in the business and affairs of the world, studying plans of wealth and greatness; we are too apt to carry these thoughts along with us into holy time; and even into the house of God, to distract our devotions, and divide our affections between God and the world. The best and most serious christians find it difficult so to call off their attention from things, to which they have for six days applied themselves, as that they shall not intrude on their minds, and disturb those meditations which are suitable to the day. Worldly desires and affections hang about them, as a dead weight, and prevent their souls from soaring on the wings of devotion to God the object of their service. Things present strike on their senses, and command their attention in spite of themselves, and in spite of the august presence of God. A sense of that presence, is mingled with reflections of base alloy; by which the spirit of devotion is damped; the heart remains cold and unaffected, with the most solemn and awful things, which can be presented to the understanding. With St. Paul, when they *would do good evil is present with them.* They *find a law in their members, warring against the law of their minds, and bringing them into captivity, to the law of sin and death;* and they are often obliged to cry out with him; *O! wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death!* They therefore stand in need of all the assistance, which God hath promised by his spirit, and yet come short of what they desire. The good things, which God hath done and is doing, are heard and seen without that heartfelt gratitude which they demand. The promises of his word are listened to without emotions of joy. The glories of the kingdom of heaven are unfolded, without awaken-

ing any vehement desire to pertake of them. The marriage feast in God's house, with all its dainties, does not relish; and they hear the mingled songs of angels and glorified saints in heaven, as described by St. John, with cold indifference.

Let us strive to think in earnest what God is, and what we are; what God hath done and promises to do; that he will be in the midst, where two or three are met together in his name; let us consider him as present, hearing the prayers of all devout worshipers; and what can be more beautiful, what more engaging to the rational mind, than a large assembly, pouring forth their joint prayers and praises to Almighty God. *We praise thee O! God, we acknowledge thee to be the Lord; Lord have mercy upon us; Christ have mercy upon us.* Seriously and devoutly contemplate these pious and devout exercises, and join in them heart and voice; and we shall seem to see heaven opened, and the eternal God upon his throne of mercy, shedding his blessed influence on all above and all below, with ten thousand times ten thousand saints and angels, throned yet adoring. These reflections can but refine and exalt the soul, to a nearer resemblance of God, and the blessed company of heaven.

[To be continued.]

Exposition of the Articles of the Church.

ARTICLE XIV.

Of Works of Supererogation.

VOLUNTARY works besides, over and above God's Commandment, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogance and impiety. For by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required. Whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants.

THE precepts contained in the gospel for the regulation of our lives are so full and comprehensive, that they include every good work which men are capable of performing. It is impossible to imagine any action acceptable to God, which does not fall within the precepts, *to love God with all our hearts—to love our neighbor as ourselves*, and, to cleanse ourselves from all filthiness both of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God. And besides these general precepts, there are particular ones directed to persons in every condition and relation of life, and extending to every point and circumstance which can possibly promote the honor of God, contribute to the happiness of our fellow creatures, or tend to purify our own minds; and all these things are enjoined as duties of perfect and universal obligation; as indispensably necessary wherever they are practicable. Since, therefore, God requires of us the entire exertion of all our powers, and not a single good action can be specified, which is not commanded in the New Testament, it follows that no room is left for voluntary works, besides, over and above God's

commandment, which they call works of supererogation; nor can such works be taught without arrogance and impiety, since they imply a degree of merit, which man in his present imperfect and corrupt state, is incapable of attaining, and are directly opposite to the plain and infallible word of God; or as the article expresses it, "For by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ saith plainly, when ye have done all that are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants." These words, which are recorded in St. Luke's gospel, are so clear and decisive, that it is unnecessary to explain or enforce them.

It is, however, well known, that works of supererogation are admitted by the members of the Romish persuasion; and it cannot but be matter of surprize, that such a doctrine should have prevailed in any church which calls itself christian. We are ordered to be perfect, even as our Father which is in heaven is perfect; and so far from being able to exceed what is required for our salvation, the gospel assures us, that after our utmost care, and best endeavors, we shall still fall short of our whole duty; and that our deficiencies must be supplied by the abundant merits of our blessed Redeemer. We are directed to trust to the mercy of God, and to work out our salvation with fear and trembling, that is, with anxiety lest we should not fulfil the conditions upon which it is offered.

Upon these grounds we may pronounce that works of supererogation are inconsistent with the nature of man, irreconcileable with the whole tenor and general principles of our religion, and contrary to the express declarations of scripture.

ARTICLE XV.

Of Christ alone without Sin.

CHRIST, in the truth of our nature, was made like unto us in all things, (sin only except) from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh and in his spirit. He came to be the lamb without spot, who by the sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world; and sin, as St. John saith, was not in him. But all we the rest (although baptized and born again in Christ) yet offend in many things; and if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

THIS article consists of two parts; in the former Christ's freedom from sin is asserted, and in the latter it is declared that all men are guilty of sin.

That Christ partook of the nature of man was shown under the second article, sin only except, from which he was clearly void, both in his flesh and in his spirit. That Christ was free from sin of every species and denomination, appears from the whole course of his life, as recorded in the gospels; and it is expressly asserted in the

following passages of the epistles. *Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. We have not an high priest, which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities; but was in all things tempted as we are, yet without sin.* Christ is also called holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners. The Socinians hold, that Christ was peaceable, or subject to sin, which seems to be a consequence of their considering him as a mere man, and of their denial of the doctrine of the atonement.

He came to be the lamb without spot, who by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world: and sin, as St. John saith, was not in him. The Jews were commanded, when they celebrated the passover, in commemoration of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, to choose out of their flocks a lamb without spot or blemish, and to offer it a sacrifice to God. This was a type of Christ, who, being without spot or sin, offered himself to God as a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world; and thence he is called the true paschal lamb: *Christ, our passover si sacrificed for us;—Behold,* saith John the Baptist, *the lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world.—Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.—Ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.*

But all we the rest (although baptized, and born again in Christ) yet offend in many things. That all men are liable to sin, and actually commit it, has been noticed in the explanation of former articles; and therefore, if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us. This latter part of the article was directed against the Pelagians and others, who asserted that men, after baptism, might live without sin. But in the ancient Fathers of the church we find a very opposite doctrine: "Let no one," says Cyprian, "flatter himself with the idea of being innocent; and by extolling himself, a person would only aggravate his punishment. He is instructed and taught that he is guilty of sin every day, since he is commanded to pray every day." Some modern enthusiasts consider themselves as entirely free from sin; and the Moravian Anabaptists are said to omit this part of our Lord's prayer, "Forgive us our tresspasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us;" because being regenerated, they are no longer guilty of sin.

While we condemn the presumption of those who think more highly of themselves than they ought to think, we must be careful not to suffer the infirmities of human nature to be abused into an encouragement to sin, or perverted into a cause of gloomy despondence: it should rather stimulate us to vigilance and exertion, than drive us to negligence or despair. Though we cannot arrive at sinless purity, it is still our duty to aim at an uniform obedience to all God's commands; and to indulge any apprehensions which tend to weaken the energy of our minds, is doubly sinful, because we thus voluntarily increase the difficulty of obedience to the will of God, and in reality doubt his assurance that our sincere endeavors to persevere in the paths of virtue and religion will be forwarded by the assistance of divine grace.

Methodist Episcopacy.

[Continued from page 350.]

BY Dr. Coke's Journal of the date of November 3d, 1784, we learn that he had then safely arrived at New-York. Here he met with Mr. Dickins, a travelling preacher, who at that time was stationed there. To him he quickly opened Mr. Wesley's *new plan*; Mr. Dickins earnestly pressed him to make it public, "because," says Dr. Coke, "as he," Mr. Dickins, "most justly argues, Mr. "Wesley has *determined* the point, though Mr. Asbury is most re- "spectfully to be consulted in respect to every part of the execution "of it. By some means or other, *the whole continent*, as it were, *ex- "pects me*. Mr. Asbury *himself* has for some time *expected me*."

"*Mr. Wesley has determined the point.*" The determination of Mr. Wesley was to silence all opposition. The American conference was to enjoy but the mere shadow of authority. To the will of the father and sovereign of Methodism, conferences, societies, preachers and people must yield implicit obedience. The conference, like the ancient Parliaments of France, was only to be used as a court to register the decrees of the Methodist pontiff. Mr. Asbury, indeed, was to be consulted and to be permitted to give his advice respecting the best mode of carrying the *new plan* into execution, but no liberty was allowed even unto him, of opposing the plan itself. That point Mr. Wesley had fully and firmly determined.

Dr. Coke seems fully to have felt his own importance, and to have been not a little elated with the consideration of the exalted station he held as deputy apostle from the Prince of Methodism resident in Bristol. So great and remarkable *an event*, as the arrival of *so eminent* a personage in the western world, must undoubtedly have caused *wonderful emotion* in the minds of all men; and the Doctor is not willing that posterity should be deprived of a record respecting *so very interesting* a circumstance: for says he, "the whole continent, as it were expects *me*; Mr. Asbury *himself* has for some time expected *me*." Surely he imagined some supernatural power had been operating on the minds of the people at large, and performing the office of a forerunner, to prepare them for his arrival.

On Sunday, November 14th, 1784, as the Journal tells us the deputy and Mr. Asbury met for the first time. "After sermon," says the Doctor, "a plain robust man came up to me in the pulpit and "kissed me. I thought it could be no other than Mr. Asbury, and I was not mistaken." Loving meeting! had camp meetings been then in fashion, we should not have been surprised, had *a hug* accompanied *the kiss*.

After dinner on the same day, the deputy privately opened the plan to Mr. Asbury. *He expressed considerable doubts about it.* We are not, however, told the nature of those doubts: possibly, *his exceeding strong attachment to the Church*, was not quite broken. But if it was not then, means were soon found to destroy it. We are also left in the dark, whether, when the plan was opened to Mr. Asbury, he was informed of Mr. Wesley's determination or not. We

should, however, suppose not, since notwithstanding Mr. Wesley's determination, an appearance of choice, of deliberation, of a power of accepting or rejecting, was still kept up. A council of preachers immediately entered into conclave, in which it was resolved, that a conference of all the preachers on the continent should be called. Mr. Freeborn Garretson was sent off to convey the resolution of the council to them, and to gather them all together at Baltimore on the approaching Christmas-eve,

At the conference which we now speak of, a circular letter from Mr. Wesley was published, dated September 10, 1784, being the same which he gave to Dr. Coke at the time he undertook to make him a new-planned bishop. The following extract of that celebrated letter is copied from Coke and More's "*Life of Wesley*," p. 352.

Bristol, September 10, 1784.

To Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and our Brethren in North America.

BY a very uncommon train of providences, many of the provinces of North America are totally disjoined from their mother country, and erected into independent states. The English government has no authority over them either civil or ecclesiastical, any more than over the states of Holland. A civil authority is exercised over them, partly by the Congress, partly by the provincial assemblies. But no one either exercises or claims any ecclesiastical authority at all. In this peculiar situation some thousands of the inhabitants of these states desire my advice; and in compliance with their desire, I have drawn up a little sketch.

For many years I have been importuned from time to time, to exercise the right of ordaining part of our travelling preachers. But I have still refused: not only for peace' sake; but because I was determined, as little as possible to violate the established order of the national Church to which I belonged.

But the case is widely different between England and North America. Here there are bishops who have a legal jurisdiction. In America there are none, neither any parish ministers. So that for some hundred miles together, there is none either to baptize, or to administer the Lord's supper. Here therefore my scruples are at an end: and I conceive myself at full liberty, as I violate no order, and invade no man's right, by appointing and sending laborers into the harvest.

I have accordingly appointed* Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury, to be joint superintendants over our brethren in North America: as also Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey to act as elders among them, by baptizing and administering the Lord's supper. And I also advise the elders to administer the supper of the Lord on every Lord's day.

If any one will point out a more rational and scriptural way of feeding and guiding those poor sheep in the wilderness, I will gladly embrace it. At present I cannot see any better method than that I have taken.

* How cautious! To use the expression *I have appointed*, instead of *I have ordained!*

It has indeed been proposed, to desire the English bishops to ordain part of our preachers for America. But to this I object, 1st. I desired the bishop of London to ordain only one; but could not prevail: 2d. If they consented, we know the slowness of their proceedings, but the matter admits of no delay. 3d. If they would ordain them *now*, they would likewise expect to govern them. And how grievously would this entangle us? 4th. As our American brethren are totally disentangled both from the state, and from the English hierarchy, we dare not entangle them again, either with the one or the other. They are now at full liberty to follow the Scriptures and the Primitive Church. And we judge it best that they should stand fast in that liberty, wherewith God has so strangely made them free. JOHN WESLEY.

Before we proceed to our remarks on this letter, it is proper to inform our readers, that Dr. Coke has not given the whole of what Mr. Wesley wrote in the one he gave him to be printed and circulated in America, but only a mutilated extract. To those who have seen it entire and considered it well, the reason why the Doctor curtailed it, will be sufficiently apparent.

"For many years," says Mr. Wesley, "I have been importuned "from time to time, to exercise the right of ordaining part of our "travelling preachers."

"*Right!*"—Whence was this right obtained? I repeat the question and answer as before....Not from his ordination as a presbyter of the Church of England. If it be said he obtained it from heaven; let his credentials be produced. When and where did he obtain it? We cannot in conscience believe Mr. Wesley himself without more proof than his own assertions: neither is the persuasion of Dr. Coke sufficient to convince us, who says Mr. Wesley received his powers in the order of God.

If I am not misinformed, Mr. Wesley himself, during the years spoken of, entertained no idea of possessing any such right, although he assumed, in the case of James Wheatly, the power of suspending from preaching and PRACTISING PHYSIC!!!—*See Myles*, p. 65.

"But I have still refused;" continues Mr. Wesley, "not only for "peace' sake; but because I was determined, as little as possible "to violate the established order of the national Church to which I "belonged."

Mr. Wesley was, like many others, a lover of peace when he could have his own way, or when he found opposition would be unavailing or hurtful to his cause: but there are very few, if any, instances recorded of him, to show that he was willing to give up even the smallest trifle where his own importance was concerned. It would have been full as becoming in him, and far more agreeable to his character as a presbyter of the Church of England, to have said, "I "received orders, 'tis true, as a presbyter, to administer the word "and sacraments as the Church and realm of England receives the "same; but no power did I receive by my ordination to ordain either bishops, elders or deacons, and I fear I have rather gone too far "in undertaking to commission lay-preachers. I have, therefore "constantly refused to ordain because I had no right so to do."

A circumstance is recorded by Mr. Myles in his "Chronological History of the Methodists:" which shows, that Mr. Wesley had no idea of the *right* of presbyters to ordain; otherwise, he would not have applied to *Erasmus, Bishop of Arcadia in Crete*, when in London, to ordain Dr. Jones.

But Mr. Wesley says, "he was determined to violate as little as "possible, the established order of the national Church to which he "belonged."

Should a servant in a well furnished house, bring in a number of persons to assist him in taking away every thing it contained, and they should strip it bare, though by degrees; we should not think it a sufficient excuse to exculpate him from the two-fold guilt of breach of trust and theft, was he to say, "I only brought in those "people to help *me*, I took away as *little as possible*; not a single ar- "ticle but what I found expedient for me to take, and what *I felt* I "wanted. I am exceedingly attached to my master's household, I "love his children, I venerate his regulations, I would not injure his "interest for the world: But then duty—duty to a superior master, "*my own infallible judgment*, teaches me, that not to gratify my own "*feelings* and *inclinations*, which are always in favor of my beloved "master, would be unpardonable. Indeed, it was my love for my "master's furniture, which caused me to act thus; and, I loved the "furniture merely for my master's sake."

In some respects, the case of Mr. Wesley was similar to this. He was placed in the Church as a guard and preserver of established order: and had solemnly promised at the altar of God, *(not erected in a private chamber,)* faithfully to perform this service; yet he caused it to be violated wherever he went, and took every opportunity of enticing others to do the same. By his ordination he engaged to exercise his ministry in subordination to his bishop and other chief ministers, which by the divine institutions, the polity of the Church, and the laws of his country, were set over him, following with a ready mind their godly admonitions. Yet to these admonitions, contempt alone was returned. To the Church he was ever professing his attachment, and yet, from a very early period of his ministry to the close of a long life, he was violating her order, in one point or another, till there was scarcely one point left which he had not violated. He not only violated points of order, but mutilated some articles of her faith, and rejected others *in toto*: he new moulded her worship and invaded the exclusive right of the highest order of her ministry. In this last point he violated the laws of the Catholic or universal Church of Christ, as well as those of that particular branch thereof, to which he belonged. Had Mr. Wesley found, that he could not, with a clear conscience, obey the laws and orders of the Church to which he belonged, he ought to have quitted her communion; we might then have esteemed him a man of sincerity and integrity, though mistaken: but these frequent, and warmly expressed, professions of attachment to the Church whilst violating every order of the Church, seem to imply a very high degree of spiritual pride, cunning, artifice, and sinister design.

We might trace the similitude still farther, but it sufficeth to say,

that Mr. Wesley violated every order which stood in his way, and then said, "I was determined to violate them as little as possible"!!!

In fine, it appears that *feelings* and *inclinations* were the pointers-out of duty to Mr. Wesley, who certainly had a great ambition to be esteemed "*some great one*," since he declared his astonishment that Bengelius should have assigned the year 1836, for the conversion of all nations to the faith of Christ, because he must have heard of his preaching! *See Hampson's Life of Wesley, Vol. 2, p. 4.* What an excessive vanity the founder of Methodism must have possessed, who unblushingly could thus undertake to become the Herald of his own fame! for my own part, I must confess, that I am inclined to think Mr. Wesley's flagrant violation of order more calculated to bring about that state of things Sir Walter Raleigh speaks of. "When," says he, "all order, discipline, and Church government, "shall be left to newness of opinion, and men's fancies; soon after, "as many kinds of religion will spring up, as there are Parish Church-"es within England; every contentious and ignorant person cloth-"ing his fancy with the *spirit of God*, and his imagination with the "gift of revelation; insomuch as when the truth, which is but *one*, "shall appear, to the simple multitude, no less variable than contrary to "itself, the faith of men will soon after die away by degrees, and all "religion be held in scorn and contempt." *See Hist. of the World, b. 2, c. 5, Sec. 1.*

The subject of the next two paragraphs of the circular letter has already been considered, when speaking of the situation of the Methodists in America, before the peace, and the chamber ordinations in the city of Bristol.

"If any one will point out a more rational and scriptural way," *and it suits with my own* FEELINGS *and* INCLINATIONS, *he should have added:* "of feeding and guiding those poor sheep in the wilderness, "I will readily embrace it. At present I cannot see any better me-"thod than that I have taken."

Love of an extensive influence and dominion, seems to have bewildered Mr. Wesley's understanding on this occasion, however infallible and under the immediate influence of divine direction he might esteem it; or else he was of the number of those concerning whom it is said, "None are so blind as they who will not see." Was Mr. Wesley in the land of the living, we might thus address him: "Why did you not advise with your old and approved friend and "brother, the Rev. Charles Wesley? He was in Bristol, *at your el-"bow.* What had he done to forfeit your confidence and affections? "Was he deficient in offering up incense on the altar you had erect-"ed to your own vanity? Did he presume to think you were not "endowed with an extraordinary commission, nor invested with the "plenitude of apostolic power? Did he dare to suggest that your in-"spiration was only ordinary, and that you possessed no more au-"thority in the Church of God than what every truly ordained pres-"byter possesses? Or did you think that God had so far forgotten "his promise to his church, that he would suffer those poor sheep "in the wilderness to perish with hunger, unless you violated his or-"ders to feed them? You had great faith sometimes, Mr. Wesley,

"about very childish things: but now your faith is very small in-
"deed, even in a very important case to which the promise of God
"is made. You were unwilling to let patience have her perfect
"work, or to wait the time when God would be pleased to visit his
"flock according to his word. But, most probably, you was afraid
"that if you did not make haste to constitute yourself their *apostle* and
"*bishop*, and get them into *your power*, some other pastors might be
"sent with *clearer testimonies* of their *right to guide and feed them*,
"than any *you had received*, or *had power to bestow*. And 'tis more
"than merely probable you had received some intimation of this, for
"it was well known that Dr. Seabury had been nigh two years in
"England to solicit episcopal consecration; and, owing to some *le-*
"*gal difficulties*, which prevented his obtaining it, was on the point
"of setting out for Scotland to be consecrated there, when you un-
"dertook to make Dr. Coke what you was pleased to call a bishop.
"These circumstances, we will venture to say, were not unknown to
"you, since we are certain from your brother Charles's letter to
"Dr. Chandler, that he was apprised thereof."

"The best course you could have taken, both for the sake of *peace*
"*and order*, in my humble opinion, would have been to have exhort-
"ed your American brethren to wait a little longer with patience, to
"have informed them that relief in a *regular and apostolic* mode was,
"most probably, not far distant; and that, in the mean time, if they
"would diligently improve what opportunities they had of exercising
"their religion, both in public and private, God would bless them,
"and bestow on them all needful blessing of grace, *without their par-*
"*taking of the ordinances*, since in his divine Providence he had per-
"mitted them to be placed in a situation where they could not *regu-*
"*larly* and *validly* obtain them. This way of acting, however, would
"not have acquired for you the honor of becoming *bishop-maker*, nor
"of founding *new churches* on *new plans*. Yes, Mr. Wesley, you seem
"to have been long convinced, as one of your biographers intimates,
"that had you been content to have exercised your ministry in con-
"formity to your most solemn ordination vows, *though you might have*
"*been admired as a scholar and a man, you could never have expected*
"*to have ranked with the Apostles.*" See Coke's Life of Wesley, p. 81.

"In fine, Mr. Wesley, you had forgot what your brother Samuel
"once read in a letter wrote by you to him. *He that took care of the*
"*poor sheep before you was born, will not forget them when you are*
"*dead.*"

The next and last part of the circular letter, contains Mr. Wesley's reasons why he did not apply to the English bishops to ordain some of the travelling preachers for America.

"1st. I desired the bishop of London to ordain only one, but could
"not prevail."

This one was a person who wished to go as chaplain in lord Cornwallis's army to America. How we came to know this particular, may be seen in the Appendix, No 1. Mr. Wesley had assumed for a long time both an ecclesiastical and *medical* supremacy: Now it would seem as if he thought he had a right to assume civil powers

also, and appoint who should be chaplains to armies! If that person had been presented to the office by the proper authority, there is no doubt but that the bishop would have ordained him, had he found him, upon examination, properly qualified, of which he, as the ordainer, was to be the judge, not Mr. Wesley.

"2d. If they consented, we know the slowness of their proceed-
"ings; but the matter admits of no delay."

It was a part of the advice of St. Paul to Timothy, and consequently to all bishops, to "*lay hands suddenly on no man.*" And certainly Mr. Wesley ought not to have blamed the bishops for slowness in so important a matter, particularly, when in so doing, they were acting agreeably to the directions given them in the holy scripture.

"But the matter admits of no delay." What! were the ordinances so essentially necessary to salvation, that in no possible case salvation might be obtained without them? Surely Mr. Wesley held no such doctrine. But whether he did or did not, he ought to have considered that ordinances, administered by those without authority, could have been obtained in America at any time, without his troubling himself to ordain Whatcoat, Vasey and Coke, and exposing them to the danger of a sea voyage of three thousand miles for that purpose; and also, that ordinances so administered are null, void and sacreligious. He ought likewise to have known, that the persons whom he ordained were not ministers according to Christ's appointment, but only of his own: and that, whatever other sects might think of the matter, he was imposing a *spurious episcopacy* and *ministry* upon his American brethren, who, as well as himself, professed to believe the Episcopalian form of church government to be the *most excellent*, and consequently the most apostolic. No material mischief could have arisen from a little longer delay. But, by this over-haste, a schism has been created which seems to be resolved to introduce all the abominations of all ancient and modern heresies combined.

But the real meaning couched in these words, "*this matter admits no delay*," appears to me, from a consideration of all circumstances, to be this. A separation and an independent church was resolved upon; presbytery for several reasons would not answer for the government intended for this church. Episcopacy was to be declared the *most excellent*, for two reasons—because it was the best adapted to the purpose designed, and because a considerable majority of the people were both from habit and education attached to Episcopacy: I mean, of those people who were to form the *new church*. Mr. Wesley's determinations were expected to carry *conviction* with them, and his reputation for holiness was to supply all deficiences of power in himself, and to excuse his assumption of episcopacy. All this seems to have been determined and reckoned upon. But delay might have ruined all, and blasted Wesley and his episcopacy forever. It was necessary that the *false bishops* should gain a footing before the true ones appeared. For bishop Seabury had, the month before the separating conference sat at Baltimore, received consecration from three Scotch bishops; and it was expected that though his applica-

tion in England had failed, that another from a different part of the states would prove more successful, and that permission would be given by parliament to the English bishops to consecrate bishops for some of the middle or southern states. These bishops would have been very generally recognized by the Methodists, their veneration for Mr. Wesley would have gradually decreased, and all he had hitherto done to get his name immortalized as the apostle of the eighteenth century, would have dwindled into nothing. This is my real opinion of the matter, but I press this opinion on no one; let every one consider for himself, and form his own opinion.

The next thing we shall notice, as having taken place at this conference, is the ordination business. Let us therefore now attend to the twice making of a Methodist or Presbyterian bishop, in order that he might be imposed on Episcopalians as a bishop *once truly made so.*

I have adopted this mode of speaking, in allusion to the attempts of certain persons to prove the validity of Methodist Episcopacy from Presbyterian principles. These persons say, "*bishop and presbyter* "*are one and the same order. Mr. Wesley was a bishop because he* "*was a presbyter. And the Methodist Church being governed by a* "*presbyter, who by being so is also a bishop, has a right to call herself* "*an Episcopal Church.*" But to proceed:—

Dr. Coke, invested with all the powers Mr. Wesley could give him for the purpose, appears as the apostle of a new sort of apostles; and elevated, no doubt, a little higher than his natural size, begins that *peculiar work* he had crossed the Atlantic to perform, viz. "*to rend the body of Christ,*" as he in union with Mr. Mather was pleased to call Mr. Hammet's schism. This piece of parchment, (an indignity to which he so severely punished in the person of Mr. Jarret, by gibbeting him in his journal,) we presume was laid on the table, (soon to be yclep'd "*an altar,*" as the "*meeting-house*" was to be transformed into "*a church*;") signed and sealed by the self-created apostle and bishop, John, the father of the plan now to be put in execution. Francis with solemn pace advances, and soon becomes a new fashioned kind of deacon. A short time intervenes and Francis again appears before the *little Doctor*, who with his two assistants, quickly accomplish the making of him a *newly devised* elder, or presbyter, or *bishop* according to the arguments of many Methodists, now-a-days; but, as these Presbyterian kind of bishops would not answer even for Methodists in those days, it was found needful for Francis to pass through a third ceremony, and be again dubb'd to something more, in appearance, of power and title, than what he had before received, so that the gaping crowd might think him truly a bishop, because John Wesley had said he should be so, and because Dr. Coke had thrice, Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey twice, and Mr. Otterbine once, laid their hands upon him: but, as Mr. Wesley was no bishop, Dr. Coke was none: and therefore, a thousand ordinations from such ordainers, were no better than one; and Francis was as good a bishop in the opinion of all true Episcopalians before Dr. Coke had laid his hands upon him at all, as he was after

also, and appoint who should be chaplains to armies! If that person had been presented to the office by the proper authority, there is no doubt but that the bishop would have ordained him, had he found him, upon examination, properly qualified, of which he, as the ordainer, was to be the judge, not Mr. Wesley.

"2d. If they consented, we know the slowness of their proceed-
"ings; but the matter admits of no delay."

It was a part of the advice of St. Paul to Timothy, and consequently to all bishops, to "*lay hands suddenly on no man.*" And certainly Mr. Wesley ought not to have blamed the bishops for slowness in so important a matter, particularly, when in so doing, they were acting agreeably to the directions given them in the holy scripture.

"But the matter admits of no delay." What! were the ordinances so essentially necessary to salvation, that in no possible case salvation might be obtained without them? Surely Mr. Wesley held no such doctrine. But whether he did or did not, he ought to have considered that ordinances, administered by those without authority, could have been obtained in America at any time, without his troubling himself to ordain Whatcoat, Vasey and Coke, and exposing them to the danger of a sea voyage of three thousand miles for that purpose; and also, that ordinances so administered are null, void and sacreligious. He ought likewise to have known, that the persons whom he ordained were not ministers according to Christ's appointment, but only of his own: and that, whatever other sects might think of the matter, he was imposing a *spurious episcopacy* and *ministry* upon his American brethren, who, as well as himself, professed to believe the Episcopalian form of church government to be the *most excellent*, and consequently the most apostolic. No material mischief could have arisen from a little longer delay. But, by this over-haste, a schism has been created which seems to be resolved to introduce all the abominations of all ancient and modern heresies combined.

But the real meaning couched in these words, "*this matter admits no delay*," appears to me, from a consideration of all circumstances, to be this. A separation and an independent church was resolved upon; presbytery for several reasons would not answer for the government intended for this church. Episcopacy was to be declared the *most excellent*, for two reasons—because it was the best adapted to the purpose designed, and because a considerable majority of the people were both from habit and education attached to Episcopacy: I mean, of those people who were to form the *new church*. Mr. Wesley's determinations were expected to carry *conviction* with them, and his reputation for holiness was to supply all deficiences of power in himself, and to excuse his assumption of episcopacy. All this seems to have been determined and reckoned upon. But delay might have ruined all, and blasted Wesley and his episcopacy forever. It was necessary that the *false bishops* should gain a footing before the true ones appeared. For bishop Seabury had, the month before the separating conference sat at Baltimore, received consecration from three Scotch bishops; and it was expected that though his applica-

tion in England had failed, that another from a different part of the states would prove more successful, and that permission would be given by parliament to the English bishops to consecrate bishops for some of the middle or southern states. These bishops would have been very generally recognized by the Methodists, their veneration for Mr. Wesley would have gradually decreased, and all he had hitherto done to get his name immortalized as the apostle of the eighteenth century, would have dwindled into nothing. This is my real opinion of the matter, but I press this opinion on no one; let every one consider for himself, and form his own opinion.

The next thing we shall notice, as having taken place at this conference, is the ordination business. Let us therefore now attend to the twice making of a Methodist or Presbyterian bishop, in order that he might be imposed on Episcopalians as a bishop *once truly made so.*

I have adopted this mode of speaking, in allusion to the attempts of certain persons to prove the validity of Methodist Episcopacy from Presbyterian principles. These persons say, "*bishop and presbyter* "*are one and the same order. Mr. Wesley was a bishop because he* "*was a presbyter. And the Methodist Church being governed by a* "*presbyter, who by being so is also a bishop, has a right to call herself* "*an Episcopal Church.*" But to proceed:—

Dr. Coke, invested with all the powers Mr. Wesley could give him for the purpose, appears as the apostle of a new sort of apostles; and elevated, no doubt, a little higher than his natural size, begins that *peculiar work* he had crossed the Atlantic to perform, viz. "*to rend the body of Christ,*" as he in union with Mr. Mather was pleased to call Mr. Hammet's schism. This piece of parchment, (an indignity to which he so severely punished in the person of Mr. Jarret, by gibbeting him in his journal,) we presume was laid on the table, (soon to be yclep'd "*an altar,*" as the "*meeting-house*" was to be transformed into "*a church;*") signed and sealed by the self-created apostle and bishop, John, the father of the plan now to be put in execution. Francis with solemn pace advances, and soon becomes a new fashioned kind of deacon. A short time intervenes and Francis again appears before the *little Doctor*, who with his two assistants, quickly accomplish the making of him a *newly devised* elder, or presbyter, or *bishop* according to the arguments of many Methodists, now-a-days; but, as these Presbyterian kind of bishops would not answer even for Methodists in those days, it was found needful for Francis to pass through a third ceremony, and be again dubb'd to something more, in appearance, of power and title, than what he had before received, so that the gaping crowd might think him truly a bishop, because John Wesley had said he should be so, and because Dr. Coke had thrice, Messrs. Whatcoat and Vasey twice, and Mr. Otterbine once, laid their hands upon him: but, as Mr. Wesley was no bishop, Dr. Coke was none: and therefore, a thousand ordinations from such ordainers, were no better than one; and Francis was as good a bishop in the opinion of all true Episcopalians before Dr. Coke had laid his hands upon him at all, as he was after

he had thrice done it. If the Presbyterians are willing to esteem him as one of their kind of presbyters or bishops, I am satisfied that they should so esteem him; but both they, and the Methodists, should know, that honesty requires us not to remove our neighbor's land-mark; therefore, if Methodist bishop means no more than a Presbyterian presbyter, let the Methodists tell us so at once, and not seek to confound and destroy all ancient and universally received principles, in order that, in the confusion, they may pass for what they have not the smallest pretension to.

But the fact is, that it was not intended to be esteemed a Presbyterian ordination, but an Episcopalian one; and this Presbyterian plea, we are confident, was only meant as *a reserve*, that in case it should ever be examined, and proved not Episcopal, it might find shelter under Presbyterian principles. But, to attempt to defend it on those principles, while it retains the name of Episcopal, while the body which receives it, calls itself an Episcopal church, and while that same body solemnly declares the Episcopalian form of church government to be the *most excellent*; is *paltry quibbling*, and *pitiful subterfuge*. Had it not been for the *officious intrusion* of a Presbyterian, who signed himself "*an* OBSERVER," during the Easton controversy, these reflections on Presbyterianism might have been dispensed with, as I have not the smallest design to irritate the feelings of that body of mistaken, as *I believe*, but, as *I also believe*, respectable body of men. Nevertheless, if even *they*, with their new auxiliaries, the Methodists, should feel themselves inclined to attack Episcopalianism, we are under no kind of apprehension respecting the result of the contest.

But the question is not at present what was the original mode of ordination and church government: therefore it is unnecessary for us now to enquire, whether the words *bishop* and *presbyter* were indiscriminately used in the first century or not; though I will be bold to say, that if they were, when applied to the second order in the ministry, they were not so used, when the first order was spoken of.—It is also far from being needful, on this occasion, to examine the pretensions of the advocates for a parity among the clergy. For nigh fifteen hundred years, at least, the whole christian world was Episcopal; and since the reformation, all sects of christians have known what was meant by the word *Episcopacy*, and what by the word *Pesbytery*. There are different and distinct ideas annexed to these words; and I trust will continue to be, whatever attempts the Methodists, or others, may make to confound them, in order, no doubt, to answer some certain purpose, not openly declared.

The Presbyterians, it is well known, acknowledge but one order in the ministry of the word and sacraments; and assert that all such ministers are equal in power and authority. The Episcopalians acknowledge three orders, of which the highest alone has the power to ordain, and which is called the order of bishops. Bishops are believed by Episcopalians to have succeeded to the apostles in the government of the church, and to have transmitted their authority down to those who at present hold that office, and who, as successors of the

apostles, are superior to, and distinct from presbyters; or even those, who are said, by some persons to have been called, in the apostolic age, bishops or presbyters indiscriminately. Now as all the ordinations of the Methodists are derived from Mr. Wesly, who was only an Episcopalian presbyter, it is manifest, that those ordinations are null on Episcopalian principles: and, having no true Episcopalian orders, they can have no claim to the title of an Episcopal church, more than the Quakers have while retaining their present system: unless we may except that right which the civil constitution has tacitly given them of calling themselves what they please. But, if they think this privilege sufficient to constitute them a true Episcopalian church of Christ, they have left not only true Episcopacy, but Presbytery also, and have gone over to a new modification of Erastianism.

But it seems Wesley had *determined* the point, Coke professed to be *fully persuaded* of it, Asbury *accepted* of it, and the pliant conference declared themselves *satisfied* with it: and also, that they were fully convinced of the validity of this curious kind of, so called, Episcopal ordination: and did unanimously receive Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as their Bishops!

Thus a complete separation was accomplished and a schism organized, not only from the Protestant Episcopal church of England in America, but from all true Episcopal churches in the world. It is a vain excuse to say, as a writer says in the *Republican Star*, 18*th Nov.* 1806, printed at Easton, Maryland, that at that time there was no church of England in America to separate from. It is indeed true that by the revolution, that part of the church which was in America, became absolved from all those civil obligations, and was freed from all those accidental circumstances attending upon the same church in England in consequence of the close connection between church and state; yet did she not cease to be still a part of the same church, and even now is in union and communion with her in all spiritual concerns. Nor did the Methodists at the time of holding their *separating conference* suppose, that the revolution had made any change in the church, more than in name and temporal situation; for in the 3d section of the Methodist book of discipline, speaking of the church of England, the conference uses the following words, "*We fear the same spirit will lead the* SAME CHURCH, *though altered* "*in name*," &c. Tis true, this passage is left out in some of the last editions; for the Methodists are in the habit of adding and diminishing as they find convenient and serviceable to their cause: but its having been inserted in even one authorised edition, is sufficient to convict that writer of a cavilling disposition, and to prove the absurdity of his excuse for *his schism*, when he said for that purpose, "*That* the Methodist church was older by five years than the Prot-"estant Episcopal church, and that, when the Methodist church was "formed they had never heard of such a church!!!" O schism! to what pitiful shifts art thou oft reduced!

he had thrice done it. If the Presbyterians are willing to esteem him as one of their kind of presbyters or bishops, I am satisfied that they should so esteem him; but both they, and the Methodists, should know, that honesty requires us not to remove our neighbor's land-mark; therefore, if Methodist bishop means no more than a Presbyterian presbyter, let the Methodists tell us so at once, and not seek to confound and destroy all ancient and universally received principles, in order that, in the confusion, they may pass for what they have not the smallest pretension to.

But the fact is, that it was not intended to be esteemed a Presbyterian ordination, but an Episcopalian one; and this Presbyterian plea, we are confident, was only meant as *a reserve*, that in case it should ever be examined, and proved not Episcopal, it might find shelter under Presbyterian principles. But, to attempt to defend it on those principles, while it retains the name of Episcopal, while the body which receives it, calls itself an Episcopal church, and while that same body solemnly declares the Episcopalian form of church government to be the *most excellent*; is *paltry quibbling*, and *pitiful subterfuge*. Had it not been for the *officious intrusion* of a Presbyterian, who signed himself "*an* OBSERVER," during the Easton controversy, these reflections on Presbyterianism might have been dispensed with, as I have not the smallest design to irritate the feelings of that body of mistaken, as *I believe*, but, as *I also believe*, respectable body of men. Nevertheless, if even *they*, with their new auxiliaries, the Methodists, should feel themselves inclined to attack Episcopalianism, we are under no kind of apprehension respecting the result of the contest.

But the question is not at present what was the original mode of ordination and church government: therefore it is unecessary for us now to enquire, whether the words *bishop* and *presbyter* were indiscriminately used in the first century or not; though I will be bold to say, that if they were, when applied to the second order in the ministry, they were not so used, when the first order was spoken of.—It is also far from being needful, on this occasion, to examine the pretensions of the advocates for a parity among the clergy. For nigh fifteen hundred years, at least, the whole christian world was Episcopal; and since the reformation, all sects of christians have known what was meant by the word *Episcopacy*, and what by the word *Presbytery*. There are different and distinct ideas annexed to these words; and I trust will continue to be, whatever attempts the Methodists, or others, may make to confound them, in order, no doubt, to answer some certain purpose, not openly declared.

The Presbyterians, it is well known, acknowledge but one order in the ministry of the word and sacraments; and assert that all such ministers are equal in power and authority. The Episcopalians acknowledge three orders, of which the highest alone has the power to ordain, and which is called the order of bishops. Bishops are believed by Episcopalians to have succeeded to the apostles in the government of the church, and to have transmitted their authority down to those who at present hold that office, and who, as successors of the

apostles, are superior to, and distinct from presbyters; or even those, who are said, by some persons to have been called, in the apostolic age, bishops or presbyters indiscriminately. Now as all the ordinations of the Methodists are derived from Mr. Wesly, who was only an Episcopalian presbyter, it is manifest, that those ordinations are null on Episcopalian principles: and, having no true Episcopalian orders, they can have no claim to the title of an Episcopal church, more than the Quakers have while retaining their present system: unless we may except that right which the civil constitution has tacitly given them of calling themselves what they please. But, if they think this privilege sufficient to constitute them a true Episcopalian church of Christ, they have left not only true Episcopacy, but Presbytery also, and have gone over to a new modification of Erastianism.

But it seems Wesley had *determined* the point, Coke professed to be *fully persuaded* of it, Asbury *accepted* of it, and the pliant conference declared themselves *satisfied* with it: and also, that they were fully convinced of the validity of this curious kind of, so called, Episcopal ordination: and did unanimously receive Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as their Bishops!

Thus a complete separation was accomplished and a schism organized, not only from the Protestant Episcopal church of England in America, but from all true Episcopal churches in the world. It is a vain excuse to say, as a writer says in the *Republican Star*, 18*th Nov.* 1806, printed at Easton, Maryland, that at that time there was no church of England in America to separate from. It is indeed true that by the revolution, that part of the church which was in America, became absolved from all those civil obligations, and was freed from all those accidental circumstances attending upon the same church in England in consequence of the close connection between church and state; yet did she not cease to be still a part of the same church, and even now is in union and communion with her in all spiritual concerns. Nor did the Methodists at the time of holding their *separating conference* suppose, that the revolution had made any change in the church, more than in name and temporal situation; for in the 3d section of the Methodist book of discipline, speaking of the church of England, the conference uses the following words, "*We fear the same spirit will lead the* SAME CHURCH, *though altered* "*in name*," &c. Tis true, this passage is left out in some of the last editions; for the Methodists are in the habit of adding and diminishing as they find convenient and serviceable to their cause: but its having been inserted in even one authorised edition, is sufficient to convict that writer of a cavilling disposition, and to prove the absurdity of his excuse for *his schism*, when he said for that purpose, "*That* the Methodist church was older by five years than the Prot- "estant Episcopal church, and that, when the Methodist church was "formed they had never heard of such a church!!!" O schism! to what pitiful shifts art thou oft reduced!

FROM THE ORTHODOX CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE.

Scriptural Illustrations.

ISAIAH xiv. 9, 18.

Hell (i. e. Hades, the receptacle of the dead) *from beneath is moved for* thee *to meet thee at thy coming; it stirreth up the dead for thee*, even *all the chief ones of the earth; it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. All the kings*, even *all o them lie in glory, every one in his own house.*

THIS sublime description of the fall of the king of Babylon, and his reception among the departed of his own rank, will be more clearly conceived by a view of the royal sepulchres in the east, which is accurately given by our countryman, Mr. Maundrell, in his travels from Aleppo to Jerusalem, page 76.

"The next place we came to was those famous grots called the Sepulchres of the Kings; but for what reason they go by that name is hard to resolve: for it is certain none of the kings, either of *Israel* or *Judah*, were buried here, the holy scriptures assigning other places for their sepultures: unless it may be thought perhaps, that Hezekiah was here interred, and that these were the sepulchres of the sons of David, mentioned in Chron. 32, 33. Whoever was buried here, this is certain, that the place itself discovers so great an expence, both of labor and treasure, that we may well suppose it to have been the work of kings. You approach to it at the east side, through an entrance cut out of the natural rock, which admits you into an open court of about forty paces square, cut down into the rock, with which it is encompassed instead of walls. On the south side of the court is a portico nine paces long, and four broad, hewn likewise out of the natural rock. This has a kind of architrave running along its front, adorned with sculpture of fruits and flowers, still discernible, but by time much defaced. At the end of the portico on the left hand, you descend to the passage into the sepulchres. The door is now so obstructed with stones and rubbish, that it is a thing of some difficulty to creep through it. But within you arrive in a large fair room, about seven or eight yards square, cut out of the natural rock. Its sides and ceiling are so exactly square, and its angles so just, that no architect with levels and plummets could build a room more regular, and the whole is so firm and entire, that it may be called a chamber hollowed out of one piece of marble. From this room, you pass into, I think, six more, one within another, all of the same fabric with the first. Of these, the two innermost are deeper than the rest, having a second descent of about six or seven steps into them.

In every one of these rooms, except the first, were coffins of stone placed in niches in the sides of the chambers. They had been at first covered with handsome lids, and carved with garlands, but now most of them were broke to pieces by sacriligious hands. The sides and ceiling of the rooms were always dropping with the moist damps condensing upon them. To remedy which nuisance, and to preserve these chambers of the dead polite and clean, there was in each room a small channel cut in the floor, which served to drain the drops which fall constantly into it."

JONAH iv. 8.

And it came to pass, when the sun did arise, that God prepared a vehement east wind; and the sun beat upon the head of Jonah that he fainted, and wished in himself to die, and said, It is better for me to die than to live.

THIS account of the extreme heat of the climate of Nineveh is well illustrated in the ingenious Mr. Campbell's Travels, page 130.

"It was early in the evening when the pointed turrets of the city of *Mosul* opened on our view, and communicated no very unpleasant sensations to my heart. I found myself on scripture ground, and could not help feeling some portion of the pride of the traveller, when I reflected that I was now within sight of NINEVEH renowned in holy writ. The city is seated in a very barren sandy plain, on the banks of the river *Tigris*, embellished with the united gifts of Pomona, Ceres and Flora. The external view of the town is much in its favor, being encompassed with stately walls of solid stone, over which the steeples or minarets of other lofty buildings are seen with increased effect. Here I first saw a caravan encamped, halting on its march from the gulph of Persia to Armenia; and it certainly made a most noble appearance, filling the eye with a multitude of grand objects, all uniting to form one magnificent whole.

"But though the outside be so beautiful, the inside is most detestable: The heat is so intense, that in the middle of the day there is no stirring out, and even at night, the walls of the houses are so heated by the day's sun, as to produce a disagreeable heat to the body, at a foot or even a yard distance from them. However, I entered it with spirits, because I considered it as the last stage of the worst part of my pilgrimage. But, alas! I was disappointed in my expectation; for the Tigris was dried up by the intensity of the heat and an unusual long drought, and I was obliged to take the matter with a patient shrug, and accommodate my mind to a journey on horseback, which, though not so long as that I had already made, was likely to be equally dangerous; and which, therefore, demanded a full exertion of fortitude and resolution.

"It was still the hot season of the year, and we were to travel through that country over which the horrid wind I have before mentioned, sweeps its consuming blasts; it is called by the Turks SAMIEL, is mentioned by holy Job under the name of the East Wind, and extends its ravages all the way from the extreme end of the Gulph of Cambaya up to Mosul; it carries along with it flakes of fire like threads of silk; instantly strikes dead those that breathe it, and consumes them inwardly to ashes; the flesh soon becoming black as a coal, and dropping off the bones. Philosophers consider it as a kind of electric fire, proceeding from the sulphureous or nitrous exhalations which are kindled by the agitation of the winds. The only possible means of escape from its fatal effects, is to fall flat on the ground, and thereby prevent the drawing it in: to do this, however, it is necessary first to see it, which is not always practicable.

"But, besides this, the ordinary heat of the climate is extremely dangerous to the blood and lungs, and even to the skin, which blisters and peels from the flesh, affecting the eyes so much that travellers are obliged to wear a transparent covering over them, to keep the heat off."

---

2 Chronicles xxviii. 3.

Moreover he burnt incense in the valley of the son of Hinnom, and burnt his children in the fire, after the abominations of the heathen.

The following extract from Sonnerat's Travels in India, will afford a correct idea of this idolatrous and inhuman practice of passing over, or through fire.

"A still more astonishing instance of the superstition of the ancient Indians, in respect to their venerated fire, remains at this day in the grand annual festival holden in honor of Darmah Rajah, and called the Feast of Fire; in which, as in the ancient rites of Moloch, the devotees walk barefoot over a glowing fire extending forty feet. It is called the feast of fire because they then walk on that element. It lasts eighteen days, during which time, those who make a vow to keep it, must fast, abstain from women, lie on the bare ground, and walk on a brisk fire. The eighteenth day, they assemble to the sound of instruments; their heads crowned with flowers, the body bedaubed with saffron, and follow in cadence the figures of Darmah Rajah, and of Drotede, his wife, which are carried there in procession. When they come to the fire they stir it to animate its activity, and take of the ashes with which they rub their forehead, and when the gods have been three times round it, they walk either fast or slow, according to their zeal, over a very hot fire, extended to about forty feet in length. Some carry their children in their arms, others lances, sabres, and standards.

"The most fervent devotees walk several times over the fire.—After the ceremony, the people press to collect some of the ashes to rub their forheads with, and obtain from the devotees some of the flowers with which they were adorned, and which they carefully preserve."—Sonnerat's Travels, vol. I. page 154.

It is evident that the abomination of which Ahaz was guilty, consisted in a practice somewhat similar to that which is here described, and not that he sacrificed or destroyed his children, as he was succeeded by his son Hezekiah, and another of his sons, Maasaiah, was slain by "Zichri, a mighty man of Ephraim." See verse 7, of this chapter.

FOR THE CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE.

Remarks on Dr. Miller's Letters on the Christian Ministry.

MR. EDITOR,

THOSE who are attentive to the concerns of our Zion have doubtless witnessed the extraordinary exertions which are making to sound forth the praises, and to promote the circulation of a work against episcopacy, entitled "Letters on the Constitution and Order of the Christian Ministry," &c. by the Rev. Dr. Miller of New-York. The zeal thus displayed loudly condems the apathy of churchmen, who, too much disposed to confide in the goodness of their cause, neglect those means by which alone it can be advanced. Were the friends of our apostolic church as zealous in promoting the circulation of works written in her defence, as her opponents are in extolling those which attack her, we should soon witness a change in the aspect of our Zion. She would become a joy and praise throughout our land. The cause of truth is great, and will prevail. The evangelical doctrines, and worship, and the apostolic ministry of our Church need only to be candidly examined and considered. They will be embraced by all who are zealous for the faith once delivered to the saints, and who revere that ministry and worship which, in the first and purest ages of christianity, martyrs consecrated with their blood.

In the work to which I have alluded, the reverend author, addressing his congregations, laments that "the order of Christ and his apostles respecting the Christian Ministry, is a subject which has received less of your attentien, and is, by many of you, less understood than it ought to be by those who profess to be members of that holy communion, which ministers are appointed to serve and govern." That the important subject of the christian ministry is indeed, *generally* but little understood, no proof more conclusive need be required, than the unqualified praises which are bestowed on Dr. Miller's work. It is said to be absolutely conclusive, unanswerable, and to have laid the cause of episcopacy forever in the dust! *Risum teneatis!* That cause, which, founded on scriptural facts and primitive testimony, has withstood the shock, with which for these three last centuries the champions of presbytery have assailed it, which in our own country has recently derived additional strength and glory from the assaults of the Rev. Dr's. Linn and Mason, (certainly men of "no mean powers") is now to be forever laid low by the pen of Dr. Miller! I mean no disrespect for this gentleman, when I assert that he has condescended to usher to the world a performance which merely retails the fallacious reasonings and misrepresentations of writers, which have been repeatedly refuted and exposed. Reasoning indeed it contains. But it is the false reasoning of Stillingfleet in his Irenicum, and of Campbell in his Ecclesiastical Lectures, and which Stillingfleet himself, in his later writings, and bishop Skinner, the antagonist of Campbell, in his "Primitive Truth and

Order," have fully answered. Does it contain just views of the order of the primitive Church, and of the sentiments of the primitive fathers concerning the order of the christian ministry? Exactly those partial views and those misrepresentations which King, Clarkson and Baxter, sought to impose upon the world; and which SLATER in his "Original Draught of the Primitive Church," and MAURICE, in his *View of Diocesan Episcopacy*, have with admirable clearness of evidence, and pungency of argument detected and exposed. That Dr. Miller should have advanced nothing new on a subject which has been so frequently discussed, casts no reflection on his ingenuity or talents. But when his work is boldly extolled as unanswerable, the public ought to be informed that it contains no arguments which have not been fully answered. The principal and distinguishing characteristics of his book, are, a plausibility of manner and confidence of assertion, which are often employed to give currency to error and to cast odium on truth.

To Sir Peter King's "Enquiry," Dr. M. is principly indebted for his views of the primitive Church, and of the opinions of the early Fathers, and concerning this book, an episcopal divine, who is represented by Dr. M. as hostile to certain episcopal pretensions, makes the following remark: "It is indeed surprising that a gentleman who lived to fill the first law office in England, should, even in his *early years*, have sent forth under his pen a book so full of mis-quotations and mistranslations."* Is it not more surprising that this book, which has been answered by Slater should be the basis of Dr. Miller's singular theories concerning the order of the primitive Church? These theories represent Dr. M. not as the advocate of presbytery, but of the *Congregational* form, in which a single congregation, with its pastor and assistants, possesses the whole power of the Church.

But for a refutation of this performance, the candid enquirers after truth need not be referred to the able writers of former times. Its fallacies are detected, and its sophistry in great part refuted, in two performances, which appeared about the time of its publication, entitled "Two Letters to the Editors of the Christians' Magazine, by a Churchman," and "An Apology for Apostolic Order and its Advocates, &c. by the Rev. John H. Hobart, of New-York."† These works have anticipated and refuted the chief of Dr. M's. arguments. In the 9th and three following letters of the "Apology for Apostolic Order," will be found a refutation of all his principal arguments from scripture, of great part of his testimony of the fathers, particularly *Jerome*, and of his testimony of the reformers and concessions of episcopalians. In the 13th letter will be found an exhibition of the argument in favor of episcopacy, from its universal and immemorial prevalence, which argument, to the powerful mind of the immortal CHILLINGWORTH, appeared a *demonstration*, but which the more vigorous mind of Dr. Miller contemns, as mere "declamation!" and the 14th letter of the apology refutes Dr. M's. remarks on the practical influence of prelacy.

* Bishop White's charge to his Clergy.

† These books, published by T. & J. Swords, New-York, are for sale at N. Haven, and the other principal towns in the different States.

Before then, those who reject episcopacy indulge in their ardent triumph, let them have the candor and independence to peruse the above works. Let them have patience until they hear the other side. Dr. Miller's work, there is good reason to believe, has been the labor of some years. We shall not demand as long to answer it; and if it cannot be proved to be full of palpable sophistry, inconsistency, misstatement, and misrepresentation, let episcopacy forever hide her head. The subject is acknowledged by Dr. M. to be "important and worthy of our serious attention." The advocate of episcopacy fears only that prejudice, which hears one party, and turns a deaf ear to the other.

AN EPISCOPALIAN.

On Preaching.

BY THE LORD CHANCELLOR BACON.

IF a preacher preach with more care and meditation (I speak not of the vain and scholastical manner of preaching; but soundly indeed, ordering the matter he handleth distinctly, for memory, deducting and drawing it down for direction, and authorizing it with strong proofs and warrants) it is censured as a form of speaking not becoming the simplicity of the gospel, and they refer it to the reprehension of St. Paul, of the *enticing speech of man's wisdom.*

Now for their own manner of preaching, what is it? Surely they exhort well and work compunction of mind, and bring men well to the question, *Viri, fratres, quid faciemus?* But that is not enough, except they resolve the question. They handle matters of controversy weakly, and as before a people that will except of any thing. In doctrine of manners there is little but generality and repetition. The word (the bread of life) they toss up and down; they break it not; they draw not their directions down *ad casus conscientiæ*, that a man may be warranted in his particular actions, whether they be lawful or not; neither, indeed, are many of them able to do it, what through want of grounded knowledge, what through want of study and time. It is a compendious and easy thing to call for the observation of the sabbath-day, or to speak against unlawful gain: but what actions and works may be done upon the sabbath, and what not; and what courses of gain are lawful, and in what cases; to set this down, and to clear the whole with good distinctions and decisions, is a matter of great knowledge and labor, and asketh much meditation and conversing in the Scriptures and other helps, which God hath provided and preserved for instruction. They forget that there are sins on the right hand as well as on the left; and that the word is double edged, and cutteth on both sides, as well the profane transgressions as the superstitious observances. Who doubteth but that it is as unlawful to shut where God hath opened, as to open where God hath shut; to bind where God hath loosed, as to loose where God hath bound? in this kind of zeal, they have pronounced generally, and without difference, all untruths unlawful; notwithstanding that the midwives are directly reported to have been blessed for their excuse to the Egyptians; that Rahab is said by faith

to have concealed the spies; that Solomon's selected judgment proceeded upon a simulation, and that our Savior, the more to touch the hearts of the two disciples, made as if he would have passed Emmaus. Farther, I have heard some sermons of mortification, think, with very good meaning, but apt to breed in men rather weak opinions and perplexed despairs, than the filial and true repentance which is sought. Another point of great inconvenience and peril is, to entitle the people to hear controversies, and all kinds of doctrine. They say no part of the council of God is to be suppressed, nor the people defrauded; so that the difference which the apostle maketh between milk and strong meat is confounded, and his precept, that the weak be not admitted into questions and controversies, taketh no place.

But, most of all is to be suspected their manner of handling the scriptures: for whilst they seek express scripture for every thing, and have deprived themselves and the church of a special help and support by embasing the authority of the fathers, they resort to naked examples, conceited influences and forced allusions, such as do mine into all certainty of religion. Wheresoever they find in the scriptures the word spoken of, they expound it of preaching; and they have made it, in a manner, of the essence of a sacrament of the Lord's Supper to have a sermon precedent; they have in a sort annihilated the use of liturgies, and forms of divine service, although the house of God be denominated principally *domus orationis*, a house of prayer and not of preaching. As for the life of the good monks and hermits in the primitive church, I know they will condemn a man as half a papist if he should maintain it as otherwise than profane, because they heard no sermons. In the mean time what preaching is, or who may be said to preach, they move no question; but (as far as I see) every man that presumeth to speak in a chair is a preacher. All these errors and misproceedings they fortify and intrench by an addicted respect to their own opinions, and an impatience to hear contradiction or argument: yea, I know some of them who would think it a tempting of God to hear or read what may be said against them.

God forbid, that every man who can take unto himself boldness to speak an hour together in a church upon a text, should be admitted for a preacher, though he mean never so well. I know there is a great latitude in gifts, and a great variety in auditors and congregations; but yet so as there is below which you ought not to descend. For you must rather leave the ark to shake as it shall please God, than put unworthy hands to hold it up. When we are in God's temple, we are warned rather to *put our hands upon our mouth, than to offer the sacrifice of fools.* And surely it may be justly thought, that amongst many causes of atheism, as schism and controversies, profane scoffing in holy matters, and the like; it is not the least, that divers do adventure to handle the word of God who are unfit and unworthy. Herein I would have no man mistake me, as if I did extol curious and affected preaching; which is as much on the other side to be disliked, and breedeth atheism and scandal as well as the other: for who would not be offended at one that cometh into the pulpit, as if he came upon the stage to play parts or prizes?

Extracts.

ON REASON AND REVELATION.

MAY we not be permitted to ask whence this assumed superiority of modern over ancient philosophers has arisen? and whence the extraordinary influx of light upon these latter times has been derived? Is there any one so infatuated by his admiration of the present age, as seriously to think that the intellectual powers of man are stronger and more perfect now, than they were wont to be; or that the particular talents of himself, or any of his contemporaries, are superior to those which shone forth in the luminaries of the Gentile world? Do the names even of Locke, Cudworth, Cumberland, Clarke, Wilkins, Wollaston, (men so justly eminent in modern times, and who laboured so indefatigably to perfect the theory of Natural Religion) convey to us an idea of greater intellectual ability than those of the consummate masters of the portico, the grove, or the Lyceum? How is it, that the advocates for the natural perfection or perfectability of human reason, do not perceive, that, for all the superiority of the present over former times, with respect to religious knowledge, we must be indebted to *some intervening cause*, and not to any enlargement of the human faculties? Is it to be believed, that any man of the present age, of whatever natural talents he may be possessed, could have advanced one step beyond the heathen philosophers, in his pursuit of Divine Truth, had he lived in *their* times, and enjoyed only the light which was bestowed upon *them?* Or can it fairly be proved, that merely by the light of nature, or by reasoning upon such data only, as men possess who never heard of Revealed Religion, any moral or religious truth has been discovered, since the days when Athens and Rome affected to give laws to the intellectual as well as to the political world? That great improvements have since been made, in framing systems of Ethics, of Metaphysics, and of what is called Natural Theology, need not be denied. But these improvements may easily be traced to one obvious cause, the widely diffused light of the gospel, which having shone, with more or less lustre, "on all nations, has imparted, even to the most simple and illiterate of the sons of men, such a degree of knowledge on these subjects, as, without it, would be unattainable by the most learned and profound."

ON FAITH.

AS in the natural world, we see that all things advance by slow and gradual progress, to maturity and perfection; so, in the spiritual world, we are trained by passing through a state of imperfect knowledge, to one that will be more satisfactory and complete. We *walk by faith* now, and *see through a glass darkly*, that our *thoughts and desires being gradually enlarged and spiritualized, we may become better qualified to undergo that great change which is prepared for us*, when according to the apostle's expression, we shall see *face to face*, and *know even as we are known*. Such a state

of preparation and discipline is also best suited to our present nature. For, as our Lord once said to his disciples, *I have many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now*;* so it may be said to every man, in his present earthly state, that there are many things hereafter to be more fully revealed which he is *now* unable to bear. Faith, which conveys to us but a partial, though a most certain knowledge, is better adapted to our finite capacities and comparatively feeble understandings, than the blaze of perfect illumination, on subjects too wonderful and excellent for us to attain to, until we shall have put off our earthly tabernacle. It seems, indeed, probable, not only that our faculties are at present *incapable* of receiving greater degrees of information, on these subjects, than is communicated through the medium of Faith; but that, even if we *could* attain to greater degrees of it, our affections would be too much elevated, and our attention drawn off from those important duties which belong to us as pilgrims on earth, and without the performance of which we cannot become meet to be partakers of our heavenly inheritance.

It is not to be doubted, therefore, that God requires us to *walk by faith*, for the purpose of correcting our pride, and teaching us the necessity of bringing our understandings, as well as our affections, into subjection to his holy will. Thus are we constantly admonished to acknowledge his wisdom and truth; to trust in him; to have recourse to him for light and instruction; to set the highest value upon his communications; to restrain our presumtuous curiosity; and *not to think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think*. By setting such bounds to our *sight*, as to disable us from walking by it in our spiritual and everlasting concerns, he shows us the value and importance of *faith*; leading us imperceptibly to that entire deference to his wisdom, and conformity to his will, which constitute the foundation of all true religion and substantial happiness.

ON MYSTERIES.

IF we adopt the too prevalent mode of recommending christianity to the judgment of the wise reasoners of this world, by suppressing its mysterious revelations, or by simplifying its precepts in such a manner as to render it a mere code of ordinary morality, we forget of what manner of spirit we should be. In any revelation delivered from heaven, it may well be supposed that there will be truths surpassing our understanding. In precepts relating to human conduct, we may reasonably expect a clear delineation of duty; and, in this respect, we challenge the infidel to produce from all his admired writers, such a rule of life as was taught by him, who was *despised and rejected of men*, but who evinced himself to be, *endued with all power from on high*. But where the nature of the godhead is concerned, we in vain attempt to search it out: we are, therefore, bound to receive that explanation of it which is delivered by divine authority. It is the province of reason to examine into the actual conveyance of any asserted revelation of the will of God; and if this be established, it behoves the finite wisdom of man to submit implicitly

* John xvi. 12.

to the doctrines that are taught, how far soever they may exceed his comprehension. And if they who assume to themselves the denomination of rational christians, will object to such a submission of the understanding, let them dispassionately inquire, whether they are not often as much baffled in their researches into the mode of their own existence, and into a variety of natural causes and effects, as they are in their presumptuous attempts to understand *all mysteries and all knowledge?*

FELLTHAM ON THE PURITANS.

I FIND many who are called Puritans; yet few or none who will own the name. The reason of which is surely this, that it is a name of infamy; and is so new, that it hath scarcely yet obtained a definition: nor is it an appellation derived from one man's name, whose tenets we can find digested into a volume: whereby we do much err in our application of it. In itself it imports a kind of excellency above one another; which man (being conscious of his own frail bendings) is ashamed to assume to himself. So that I believe there are men who would be Puritans; but not any that indeed are so. One will have him to be one who lives religiously and will not revel in an unbounded excess; another, him who separates from our divine assemblies; another, him who, in some tenets only, is peculiar; another, him who will not swear. Absolutely to define him is, I think, a work of difficulty. Some I know who rejoice in the name, but they are such as least understand it. A Puritan, as he is more generally, in these times, taken to be, is a church-rebel, or one who would exclude order, that his brain may rule. To decline offences; to be careful and conscientious in our several actions, is a purity which every man ought to labor for, and which we may well do, without sullenly separating ourselves from society. If there be any privileges, they are surely granted to the children of the king, who are those that are the children of heaven. If mirth and recreations be lawful, surely such a one may lawfully use them. If wine was given to cheer the heart, why should I fear to use it for that end? The merry soul is freer from intended mischief, than the man of gloomy thoughts. God delights in nothing more than in a cheerful heart, careful to perform him service. What parent is it, that rejoices not to see his child cheerful while within the limits of filial duty? It is true, we read of Christ's weeping, not of his laughter: yet we know that he graced a feast with his first miracle, and that a feast of joy; and can we think that such a meeting could pass without the noise of laughter? What a lump of quickened care is the melancholy man! Change anger into mirth, and the precept will hold good still: *be merry, but sin not.* As there are many, who in their lives assume too great a liberty; so I believe there are some who abridge themselves of what they might lawfully use. Ignorance is an ill steward to provide for either soul or body. A man who submits to reverend order, who sometimes unbends himself in a moderate relaxation; and in all things labors to improve himself in the sereneness of a healthful conscience; such a Puritan I will love immutably. But

when a man, in things but ceremonial, shall spurn at the grave authority of the church, and out of a needless nicety, be a thief to himself, of those benefits which God has allowed him; or out of a blind and uncharitable pride, censure and scorn others as reprobates; or out of obstinacy, fill the world with brawls about indeterminable tenets; I shall think him one of those, whose opinion hath fevered his zeal to madness and distraction. I have more faith in one Solomon, than in a thousand such. Behold then, what I have seen good! That it is meet for man to eat and to drink, and to take pleasure in all his labor wherein he travails under the sun, the whole number of the days of his life, which God gives him;—for this is his *portion*. Nay, *there is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink, and that he should make his soul enjoy good in his labor*. Methinks the reading of Ecclesiastes should make a Puritan undress his brain, and lay off all those fanatic toys that jingle about his understanding. For my part, I think the world hath not better men than some who suffer under that name, nor yet worse and more mischievous."

The following account of the Reformation is very neat and judicious.

"THE Reformation was an event of inestimable value to the human race. But with much good it brought also along with it much evil. It excited various and violent passions, and gave rise to divisions and animosities in the church of Christ, which have raged with more or less destructive violence ever since. In England this great event was conducted with distinguished moderation. The leaders in this work of God rejected with firmness the errors and corruptions of the church of Rome; but they did not absurdly think that they had to form a new church, or found a new religion. No; they did not walk by metaphysical reasoning, nor by the doubtful principles and glimmering light of moral science. They read the scriptures, and enquired into the history of the primitive church, and whatever they found agreeable to these authorities, they firmly retained. Their laudable, enlightened, and moderate conduct, was approved at the time, as it has been since, by all who were capable of judging; and even the most illustrious of the foreign reformers, who had acted very differently, as they pleaded from necessity, added in the amplest form their testimony of approbation. Against the principles of episcopal government, thus reformed, the plea of necessity was urged by some, and that of conscience by others.—By referring to the period, it is easy, even for an unconcerned spectator, to discover on which side existed moderation, and reason, and authority; and on which passion, and prejudice, and violence. The dispute being once, from whatever cause, unhappily excited, it is not difficult to conceive how it should have been continued from age to age."

The following advice on plain and practical preaching cannot be too carefully attended to.

"IF the post assigned unto us, be that of pastors of a country parish, we must earnestly endeavor 'to know our sheep and to be known of them.' We must never suffer ourselves to lose sight of the Apostle's maxim, that 'knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth.'—Gifted as we have been with a learned education, and taught to discern and to appreciate the various elegancies of style in literary compositions; accustomed as we are, in the course of our studies, to take a lively interest in deep and argumentative disquisitions and theological controversy, we must *consider* those, who are the objects of our instruction. The plain unlettered man 'receiveth not these things, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are learnedly 'discerned.' Let not our preaching be ostentation, as to ourselves, and mockery unto those that hear us: but let it be unto them 'edification, and exhortation and comfort.' We must sacrifice the beauties of style to plainness of speech, and renounce the scholastic rules of art, for that mode of practical reasoning, which is accommodated to the capacities of our congregation. If we employ figurative language and comparisons, let them be chiefly borrowed from those objects, with which country folks are familiar. Rural scenes, rural occupations and the succession of seasons, which induce change and variety on the face of nature and the labors of man, afford abundant means of lively illustration, and suggest unto us, on various occasions, appropriate and striking subjects, for the *instruction of the day*. Thus it will appear, that the subjects of our discourses are not *carelessly* nor *casually* selected: nor will our preaching be denominated the cold formality of a stated service; but by being thus variously and judiciously adapted to the times, seasons, and persons, before us, it will carry with it proofs, that we are 'zealously affected as to the main object of our ministry:' that we are in earnest, and on the watch to catch at every passing subject and improve every occasion, that is likely to interest and affect our hearers, to their spiritual edification.

"But let it not be imagined, that plainness of speech implies *vulgarity*, or that disclaiming the rules of art and the aids of learning, we are at liberty to deliver from the pulpit desultory and colloquial effusions. Simplicity of style, and a due adaptation of the means of persuasion to those, who are to be the objects of it, so that the preacher and his discourse be respected, whilst he persuades, may appear a work of ease, but it is an ease which cannot be attained unto without difficulty. The greatest effort of art is to *conceal* art. We never can express ourselves *plainly* on a subject which we do not *clearly* comprehend. The minister who preaches the gospel of Jesus Christ has the dignity of that gospel to support: he himself also has the character of a minister of that gospel to maintain; a quaint and affected familiarity of style or manner debases both. Our discourses may be disrobed of 'ambitious ornaments,' and yet neither nakedness nor deformity may appear: they may possess that chaste simplicity, which is neither bereaved of strength, nor destitute of grace."

POETRY.

The Thunder Storm.

BY J. MONTGOMERY.

O for evening's brownes shade!
Where the breezes play by stealth
In the forest cinctured glade,
Round the hermitage of HEALTH:
While the noon bright mountain's blaze
In the sun's tormenting rays.

O'er the sick and sultry plains,
Through the dim delirious air,
Agonizing silence reigns,
And the wanness of despiar;
Nature faints with fervent heat—
Ah! her pulse hath ceas'd to beat.

Now in deep and dreadful gloom,
Clouds on clouds, portentous spread,
Black as if the day of doom
Hung o'er NATURE's shrinking head:
Lo! the lightning breaks from high—
GOD is coming! GOD is nigh!

Hear ye not his chariot wheels,
As the mighty thunder rolls?
NATURE, startled NATURE reels,
From the centre to the poles;
Tremble! ocean, earth and sky!
Tremble! GOD is passing by!

Darkness, wild with horror, forms
His mysterious hiding place;
Should he, from his ark of storms,
Rend the veil and show his face,
At the judgment of his eye,
All the universe would die.

Brighter, broader lightnings flash,
Hail and rain tempestuous fall;
Louder, deeper thunders crash,
Desolation threatens all;
Struggling Nature gasps for breath,
In the agony of death.

GOD of VENGEANCE! from above,
While thine awful bolts are hurl'd,
O remember thou art LOVE!
Spare! O spare a guilty world!
Stay thy flaming wrath awhile,
See thy bow of promise smile!

Welcome, in the eastern cloud,
Messenger of Mercy still!
Now, ye winds, proclaim aloud,
"Peace on earth, to man good will!"
Nature!—God's repenting child,
See thy Parent reconcil'd!

Hark! the Nightengale, afar,
Sweetly sings the sun to rest,
And awakes the evening star
In the rosy tinted west:
While the moon's enchanting eye
Opens Paradise on high!

Cool and tranquil is the night,
NATURE's sore afflictions cease,
From the storm, that spent its might,
Was a covenant of peace:
VENGEANCE drops her harmless rod;
MERCY is the POWER OF GOD!

OBITUARY.

DIED at Reading, October 3d, Mr. TURNER GILBERT, in the 28th year of his age. An appropriate discourse was delivered the Sunday following, by the Rev. Deacon Elijah G. Plumb, from Sam. iii. 32....*But though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion according to the multitude of his mercies.* The marked composure and settled firmness, manifested by this young man during his long decline, evidently prove, that his faith was not the visionary phantom of an idle dream; but a reasonable and well grounded hope of a happy immortality.

—— At Waterbury, Sept. 26th, in the 38th year of his age, of a sudden illness, RICHARD WELTON, Jun. He was a man of an agreeable, friendly and kind disposition. His friends who best knew him, can testify that a spirit of benevolence governed his heart, and appeared in his life: that he was unwilling to return evil, disposed to do right, and even gloried *to overcome evil with good.* He was indeed naturally diffident, yet still he ever manifested a firm attachment and love to the path of his duty. The only anchor of his hope was the merits of his Savior, and the rule of his obedience the word of God. The day subsequent, his funeral was attended by a large concourse of people, and a sermon preached on the subject of mortality, from Psalm xlviii. 14....*For this God is our God forever and ever: he will be our guide even unto death.*